DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 130	EA 016 223
TITLE	Procedures for Making Grant Awards under Three Department of Education Discretionary Grant Programs. Report.
INSTITUTION	General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	GAO/HRD-83-68
PUB DATE	26 Jul 83
NOTE	90p.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. General Accounting Office, Document Handling and Information Services Facility, P.O. Box 6015, Gaithersburg, MD 20760 (first five copies free).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Categorical Aid; Educational Finance; Eligibility; Equal Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Federal Aid; Federal Regulation; Financial Support; Government School Relationship; *Grants; Grantsmanship; Program Proposals
IDENTIFIERS	*National Institute of Education; Talent Search; Womens Educational Equity Act

ABSTRACT

Procedures are described for selecting field readers and awarding grants under the Women's Educational Equity Act Program, National Institute of Education, and Talent Search Programs. Information is provided for each on (1) the legislation, regulations, policy, and program directives that govern the grant award process; (2) how and by whom funding priorities are established; (3) how field readers are recruited and selected; (4) the field reader selection criteria; (5) field reader training and orientation; (6) procedures for reviewing, scoring, ranking, and selecting applications; (7) the extent to which final grant selections differed from field reader rankings; (8) the process used to determine final grant amounts; and (9) the percentage of requested funds received in 1981 and 1982. Separate appendixes cover department regulations and directives, a description of the Field Reader Outreach Program, and a chart listing educational background, employment, and organizational affiliations of 1981 field readers for the Women's Educational Equity Act Program. (TE)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

EA

ED238130

REPORT BY THE U.S.

General Accounting Office

Procedures For Making Grant Awards Under Three Department Of Education Discretionary Grant Programs

This report describes the procedures for selecting field readers and awarding grants under the Women's Educational Equity Act, Talent Search, and Unsolicited Proposal discretionary grant programs. It also compares the field readers used by each program in terms of certain demographic characteristics, such as gender and race/ethnicity.

The report was requested by the Subcommittee on Select Education, the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, and the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, House Committee on Education and Labor.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EA 016 223

GAO/HRD-83-68
JULY 26, 1983

Request for copies of GAO reports should be sent to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Document Handling and Information
Services Facility
P.O. Box 6015
Gaithersburg, Md. 20760

Telephone (202) 275-6241

The first five copies of individual reports are free of charge. Additional copies of bound audit reports are $3.25 each. Additional copies of unbound report (i.e., letter reports) and most other publications are $1.00 each. There will be a 25% discount on all orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address. Sales orders must be prepaid on a cash, check, or money order basis. Check should be made out to the "Superintendent of Documents".

UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION

B-212000

The Honorable Austin J. Murphy
Chairman, Subcommittee on Select Education
House Committee on Education and Labor

The Honorable Carl D. Perkins
Chairman, Subcommittee on Elementary,
Secondary and Vocational Education
House Committee on Education and Labor

The Honorable Paul Simon
Chairman, Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
House Committee on Education and Labor

In your June 14, 1982, joint letter, you requested information on the procedures for awarding discretionary grants under three programs administered by the Department of Education (ED). In later discussions with your offices, we agreed to limit our work to the Women's Educational Equity Act Program (WEEAP) and the National Institute of Education's Unsolicited Proposal Program for 1981 and 1982 and the Talent Search Program for 1982 only.

For each of the three grant programs, you asked for information on (1) the legislation, regulations, and directives that govern them, (2) how and by whom grant funding priorities are established, (3) how field readers who review grant proposals are recruited and selected, (4) the field reader selection criteria, (5) the training and orientation provided to readers, (6) procedures for reviewing, scoring, ranking, and selecting grant applications, (7) the extent to which final selections differed from reader recommendations, (8) the process used to determine final grant amounts, and (9) the percentage of requested funds that successful applicants received in 1981 and 1982. We also agreed to provide information on certain characteristics, including the sex and ethnicity, of readers used in 1981 and 1982 for WEEAP and the Unsolicited Proposal Program and in 1980 and 1982 for the Talent Search Program. Further, we agreed to compare the grant award procedures used in 1981 and 1982 by WEEAP and the Unsolicited Proposal Program.

To identify applicable legislation, regulations, guidelines, and directives, we interviewed staff from the three programs, as well as representatives from ED's Office of the General Counsel, the National Institute of Education's Office of Grants and Contracts, and ED's Assistance Management and Procurement Service.

To determine how field readers were recruited and selected, grant competitions conducted, and award decisions made, we reviewed relevant legislation, regulations, program plans, instructions, and other relevant documents and interviewed knowledgeable ED and program officials and others associated with the grant competition. We developed reader characteristics by interviewing program officials and by reviewing the resumes, vitae, information sheets, and other related information on file.

The information we developed is summarized below and detailed in appendixes I through V.

LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND PROGRAM DIRECTIVES

The Women's Educational Equity Act, the General Education Provisions Act, and the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, respectively, established WEEAP, the Unsolicited Proposal Program, and the Talent Search Program. All three programs are governed by ED's General Administrative Regulations and General Grant Regulations. The General Administrative Regulations establish general rules on how grants are made, authorize the use of experts to evaluate applications, and establish general criteria on which applications are evaluated and award decisions made. The General Grant Regulations establish uniform requirements for administering grants and principles for determining costs applicable to activities assisted by grants.

Each program's regulations establish specific criteria for evaluating proposals and awarding grants. ED procedures and requirements for conducting grant competitions are outlined in grants administration manuals. Additionally WEEAP and the Talent Search Program annually prepare technical review plans that outline the application review procedures to be used during a specific year's grant competition. The Unsolicited Proposal Program is also subject to various internal Institute directives.

ESTABLISHING PROGRAM PRIORITIES

For WEEAP, the Secretary of Education is required to set priorities for funding grants. The Secretary published a "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" in the May 25, 1979, Federal Register which identified and described the proposed funding priorities. After considering written public comments on the notice and receiving input from public hearings held throughout the country, the Secretary published final WEEAP regulations on April 3, 1980, which contained five funding priorities. These priorities involved model projects (1) on compliance with Federal requirements prohibiting sex discrimination in education, (2) on educational equity for racial and ethnic minority women, (3) on educational equity for disabled women, (4) to influence leaders in educational policy and administration, and (5) to eliminate persistent barriers to educational equity for women.

The regulations also provide that funds may be awarded for "other authorized activities" related to educational equity for women and girls which are not included under one of the specific priorities. In 1981, proposals under the first four priorities and "other authorized activities" were funded. In 1982, proposals were funded under the five specific priorities only.

The Unsolicited Proposal Program has no established funding priorities since its purpose is to identify unique or alternative proposals to those submitted in response to other specific grant announcements.

The types of projects that may be funded under Talent Search are outlined in the authorizing legislation. These include projects to (1) identify youths with potential for education at the postsecondary level and encourage youths to complete secondary school and undertake a postsecondary education program and (2) publicize the availability of financial aid for postsecondary education.

FIELD READER SELECTION

ED uses field readers to help evaluate applications submitted under the three grant programs. Each program has different bases for selecting field readers. WEEAP criteria provide that readers have (1) a commitment to women's educational equity and knowledge of and experience in issues relating to educational equity, (2) experience in one of the funding priorities, and (3) experience in 1 of 11 educational areas.

The field readers were selected by the WEEAP staff in 1981 and by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education in 1982. The 1981 readers were selected from a list of names obtained by program staff from such sources as educational organizations, other ED offices, and former grantees. The 1982 readers were selected by the Office of the Assistant Secretary from a list referred by ED's Field Reader Outreach Program. The Outreach Program was established in March 1982 because of concern in ED that the same individuals, who exhibited a "liberal" bias, were being used as readers year after year and had become part of each program's network, thus minimizing the independence of the field reader evaluation process. Through the Outreach Program ED attempted to identify new readers with "conservative philosophies" and give more responsibility to senior ED officials for selecting readers.

Based on our review of the WEEAP field reader resumes, it is our judgment that 1 (or 1 percent) of the 1981 readers and 11 (or 20 percent) of the 1982 readers did not meet any of the program's selection criteria. It should be noted, however, that the criteria are subjective since there is no clear definition of "commitment" or "expertise."

There are no written criteria for the selection of reviewers for the Unsolicited Proposal Program; however, according to National Institute of Education staff, reviewers should have knowledge of the area covered by the proposal and experience in or knowledge of educational research. Reviewers in 1981 and 1982 were selected from different sources. In 1981, as in previous years, staff from three discrete program areas independently selected reviewers to review unsolicited proposals assigned to their respective program areas. Staff selected reviewers based on their knowledge of experts in the area addressed by the proposal. In 1982 the program staff was required to select a portion of reviewers from a list compiled by the Office of the Director. Of the 119 individuals recommended by the Director's office, 96, or about one-third of the 272 reviewers in 1982, were used for 50 percent of the reviews. Program staff selected the remaining reviewers independently as they had done in previous years.

We reviewed information available for a random sample of reviewers used in 1981 and 1982 for the Unsolicited Proposal Program to determine if the reviewers possessed experience in or knowledge of educational research. We considered an individual's academic training, occupation, and institutional affiliation as they related to National Institute of Education research topics and his/her professional accomplishments, such as published books or journal articles on education and related issues. We did not determine the extent to which reviewers possessed knowledge of the areas covered by the proposal.

For 1981, we estimate that sufficient information was not available for 53 (or 26 percent) of the 205 reviewers to permit us to make a determination. The other 152 reviewers, in our estimation, did have experience in or knowledge of educational research. For 1982, we estimate that sufficient information was not available for 32 (or 12 percent) of the 272 reviewers to permit us to make a determination. Of the other 240 reviewers, 231 (or 96 percent) had experience in or knowledge of educational research, and 9 (or 4 percent) did not.

The 1982 Talent Search readers were selected by program staff from a computerized file of 1,700 individuals who had been identified by the staff as qualified readers. Initial efforts to create the file began in 1978 and were followed by an extensive systematic recruitment campaign. Since the initial file was established, there have been some additional informal efforts to recruit new readers, such as requesting active field readers to refer qualified colleagues. Talent Search readers were required to have at least an undergraduate degree and meet two of six experience criteria, which included experience in secondary and postsecondary education, knowledge of the program, and experience in working with disadvantaged individuals. We reviewed resumes and other documentation to determine if the 1982 readers met the education and experience selection criteria. All 75 readers met the education criteria. We determined that 55 met the experience criteria; documentation for the other 20 did not provide enough information to permit a determination.

In all three programs there were some differences, for the program years we compared, in either the sex or the ethnicity of the field readers used. In 1981 almost 80 percent of the WEEAP readers were Black, Hispanic, Asian American, or Native American; in 1982 about 24 percent were from these minority groups. Representation by sex was comparable in both years. In 1981, we estimate that 32 percent of the Unsolicited Proposal Program reviewers were Black, Hispanic, Asian American, or Native American; in 1982, 15 percent were from these groups. We estimate that 46 percent of the 1981 readers for the Unsolicited Proposal Program were women versus 35 percent in 1982. In the Talent Search Program, a greater percentage of women and minorities were used as field readers in 1982 than in 1980.

TRAINING AND ORIENTATION FOR FIELD READERS

Training and orientation procedures were similar in the three programs. Before the grant reading sessions, readers were mailed a package of material which included information on program objectives, program regulations, evaluation techniques, and conflict of interest regulations. At the beginning of the competition, readers attended an orientation session at which additional instructions were provided. In the case of WEEAP, a more extensive orientation session was provided in 1981 than in 1982.

In 1981, the WEEAP director conducted a 4-hour orientation session, which covered the purpose of WEEAP, the applicable regulations, the scoring process, how proposals are ranked and award decisions are made, and the necessity for each field reader to provide an independent review. In 1982, staff from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education conducted a 1-hour orientation session in which they discussed assignments of readers to proposals, scoring procedures, conflicts of interest, field reader reimbursement, and the confidentiality of information contained in proposals. In 1982, because the administration's budget for 1983 did not contain funding for WEEAP, readers were instructed to evaluate applications based on whether the proposals' objectives could be achieved with 1 year of funding. In 1981 and previous years, multiyear proposals were funded.

SCORING AND RANKING

Basically the criteria to be used by the readers in evaluating and scoring applications were the same for the three programs. These include considering the (1) need for and impact of the proposal, (2) quality of the plan of operation, (3) quality of key personnel and the adequacy of resources, and (4) reasonableness of the budget.

Various methods were used to compute a final score. For WEEAP in 1981 and 1982 and the Unsolicited Proposal Program in 1981, the individual reader scores were standardized, averaged, and ranked according to the average standardized score. (Standardization is a technique used to minimize the tendency of some readers to score consistently high or consistently low.) For the Unsolicited Proposal Program in 1982, because the number of proposals read by each field reviewer was relatively small, standardization was not statistically feasible. Instead, proposals were ranked according to the simple average of the readers' scores.

Talent Search applications were ranked according to a "composite score" arrived at by calculating a simple average of the three reader scores and, if applicable, adding between 1 and 15 priority points to the average. Priority points are assigned only to applications from previous recipients of Talent Search grants; the number of points are determined by the program staff based on an evaluation of an applicant's performance in a prior project.

SELECTING APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING

In selecting applications for funding, ED officials may deviate from field reader rankings. However, deviations must be explained. Except for the 1982 WEEAP competition, none of the programs funded applications according to rank order. Some reasons given for the deviations were that the recommended project (1) duplicated a previously funded project or another project being funded in the same year, (2) was not cost effective, (3) did not address an ED or program priority, or (4) exceeded the scope of projects authorized to be funded. However, not all deviations were explained.

To determine the final funding levels for each approved application, program staffs review the applicant's proposed budget; identify both allowable and what appear to be unnecessary types of costs, or costs that exceed preestablished program guidelines; and develop recommended budgets. The recommended budgets are forwarded to the cognizant Assistant Secretary or the Director of the National Institute of Education, as appropriate, for approval. The approved budget is sent to a grants officer, who contacts the applicant and negotiates the final funding amount.

Most Talent Search grants were funded at less than 90 percent of the amounts requested, and most WEEAP and Unsolicited Proposal grants received more than 90 percent of the amounts requested.

- - - -

This report was not sent to the Department of Education for its review. However, the matters contained herein were discussed with Department representatives.

Copies of this report will be sent to the Secretary of Education and other interested individuals and will be made available to others upon request.

Richard L. Fogel

Richard L. Fogel
Director

Contents

Page

APPENDIX

I PROCEDURES FOR AWARDING GRANTS 1
- Objectives, scope, and methodology 1
- Women's Educational Equity Act Program 3
  - Legislation, Department regulations, and program directives 4
  - Establishing WEEAP funding priorities 5
  - Recruiting potential field readers 7
  - Selecting field readers 8
  - Characteristics of field readers 12
  - Conducting the grant reading session 14
  - Ranking and selecting applications for funding 15
  - Determining final funding amounts 19
- National Institute of Education 21
  - Legislation, Department regulations, and program directives 22
  - Selecting reviewers 23
  - Characteristics of reviewers 27
  - Evaluation of proposals 29
  - Ranking and selecting proposals for funding 31
  - Determining final funding amounts 35
- Talent Search 36
  - Legislation, Department regulations, and program directives 38
  - Selecting field readers 39
  - Characteristics of field readers 42
  - Conducting the grant reading session 45
  - Scoring 46
  - Ranking and selecting applications for funding 47
  - Determining final funding amounts 48

II LEGISLATION, DEPARTMENT REGULATIONS, AND PROGRAM DIRECTIVES 50

III FIELD READER OUTREACH PROGRAM 53

IV EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, EMPLOYMENT, AND ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF 1981 WEEAP FIELD READERS 55

V EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, EMPLOYMENT, AND ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF 1982 WEEAP FIELD READERS 70

ABBREVIATIONS

DSS	Division of Student Services
ED	Department of Education
NIE	National Institute of Education
WEEAP	Women's Educational Equity Act Program

PROCEDURES FOR AWARDING GRANTS

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

In a June 14, 1982, letter, the Chairmen of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, the Subcommittee on Select Education, and the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor asked us to review the procedures used to award new discretionary grants under the Women's Educational Equity Act Program (WEEAP), the TRIO Programs, and programs at the National Institute of Education (NIE). We were asked to obtain information on (1) the legislation, regulations, policy, and program directives that govern the grant award process, (2) how and by whom funding priorities are established, (3) how field readers are recruited and selected, (4) the field reader selection criteria, (5) field reader training and orientation, (6) procedures for reviewing, scoring, ranking, and selecting applications, (7) the extent to which final grant selections differed from field reader rankings, (8) the process used to determine final grant amounts, and (9) the percentage of requested funds received in 1981 and 1982.

In later discussions with Subcommittee staff, we were asked to

--compare the 1981 and 1982 WEEAP grant competitions and develop demographic information for individuals who served as field readers in those years;

--determine if 1981 and 1982 WEEAP readers met field reader selection criteria;

--review NIE's 1981 and 1982 Unsolicited Proposal Program competition and develop information on the sex, race/ethnicity, and educational research experience of 1981 and 1982 readers; and

--limit our review of the TRIO programs to the 1982 Talent Search competition, but compare 1980 and 1982 readers according to sex and race/ethnicity.

To identify applicable legislation, regulations, guidelines, and directives, we interviewed staff from the three programs, as well as a representative from the Department of Education's (ED's) Office of the General Counsel, NIE's Office of Grants and Contracts, and ED's Assistance Management and Procurement Service.

To determine how field readers were recruited and selected, grant competitions conducted, and award decisions made, we reviewed relevant legislation, regulations, program plans, and instructions and interviewed knowledgeable Department and program officials and others associated with the grant competition.

We interviewed the WEEAP director and her staff, representatives from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, the WEEAP grants officer, and several 1982 WEEAP field readers.

We also interviewed the former Acting Director of NIE and a member of the Director's staff involved in identifying and selecting 1982 field readers, the Unsolicited Proposal Program coordinator, and former and current program staff involved in conducting the 1981 and 1982 competitions.

To develop the requested information on the Talent Search Program, we interviewed a representative of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, the Director of the Division of Student Services (DSS), various branch chiefs, and other individuals responsible for the operation of the Talent Search Program.

To determine how the 1982 Field Reader Outreach Program was conducted, we interviewed representatives of the Office of the Deputy Undersecretary for Management, the director of the Outreach Program, and Assistant Secretaries and other senior officials (or their representatives) located at ED headquarters. We also spoke with the Secretary's 10 regional representatives (or their staff) and representatives of private research organizations involved in the Outreach Program.

We developed the requested demographic information by interviewing program officials responsible for selecting readers and by reviewing the resumes, vitae, information sheets, and/or other information on file for each of the 1980 and 1982 Talent Search and 1981 and 1982 WEEAP field readers and for 50 of the 205, 1981 and 60 of the 272, 1982 NIE reviewers for unsolicited proposals. At NIE, the individuals for whom demographic information was developed were selected randomly from the universe of 1981 and 1982 reviewers. We are 95 percent certain that the percentage estimates developed from the sample will not vary from the actual percentages by more than about 10 percent.

Our review was performed in accordance with generally accepted government audit standards, except that we did not obtain formal Department comments on a draft of the report. We did, however, discuss the matters contained herein with Department representatives, and their views have been considered.

THE WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL EQUITY ACT PROGRAM

The Women's Educational Equity Act, initially included as part of the Education Amendments of 1974, was reauthorized under the Education Amendments of 1978 as title IX, part C, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (20 U.S.C. 3341-3348).

The reasons for and purpose of WEEAP are stated in the act's first section:

> "The Congress finds and declares that educational programs in the United States, as presently conducted, are frequently inequitable as such programs relate to women and frequently limit the full participation of all individuals in American society. * * * It is the purpose of this part to provide educational equity for women in the United States."

Educational equity for women, as defined in the implementing regulations, means:

> "The elimination in educational institutions, programs and curricula of discrimination on the basis of sex and of those elements of sex role stereotyping and sex role socialization that prevent full and fair participation by women in educational programs and in American society generally;
>
> "The responsiveness of educational institutions, programs, curricula, policymakers, administrators, instructors, counselors, and other personnel to the special educational needs, interests, and concerns of women that arise from inequitable educational policies and practices; and
>
> "The elimination of stereotyping by sex, so that both men and women can choose freely among and benefit from opportunities in educational institutions and programs with limitations determined only by each individual's interests, aptitudes, and abilities."

To achieve its goals, the act authorizes the Secretary of Education to award grants to and enter into contracts with public agencies and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals for projects designed to achieve educational equity for women.

To determine which agencies and individuals receive grants, the Secretary conducts an annual grant competition. Organizations, agencies, and individuals submit applications for general grants (more than $25,000) and small grants ($25,000 or below) under one or more of the WEEAP funding priorities. Applications are evaluated by panels of outside experts--field readers--who are selected because of their interest and experience in issues related to women's educational equity. Panel members may include Federal employees. Each application is reviewed by three field readers, who score the application on the basis of pre-established evaluation criteria. Applications are then ranked according to the field readers' scores. Program officials review the top-ranked general and small grant applications in each priority and determine which will be funded.

In 1981, about $1.1 million was awarded for new grants through the competitive process described above. In 1982, about $603,000 was awarded for new grants.

The Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education is responsible for administering the act. The WEEAP office, a part of the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, carries out the program's day-to-day operations; the program director reports to the Assistant Secretary. In 1981 WEEAP was located in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Legislation, Department regulations, and program directives

WEEAP's operations are governed by the Women's Educational Equity Act, several departmental regulations, and program directives, including the

--ED General Administrative Regulations;

--ED General Grant Regulations;

--WEEAP regulations;

--Ed Grants and Procurement Management Manual, chapter III, section 2; and

--Department of Health and Human Services Grants Administration Manual.

In addition, WEEAP annually prepares a technical review plan, which outlines application review procedures for conducting the grant competition in a given year. Each of these regulations or policy guidelines is discussed briefly in appendix II.

Establishing WEEAP funding priorities

The act requires the Secretary of Education to set priorities for funding grants. In the May 25, 1979, Federal Register the Secretary published a "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking," which identified and described the proposed funding priorities. After considering written public comments on the notice and receiving input from public hearings held throughout the country, the Secretary published final WEEAP regulations on April 3, 1980, which contained the following five WEEAP funding priorities.

Model projects on title IX compliance. This priority is intended to develop model programs and materials that will help educational institutions achieve compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. Title IX prohibits sex discrimination in education programs that receive Federal funds.

Model projects on educational equity for racial and ethnic minority women and girls. This priority is intended to address issues of double discrimination, bias, and stereotyping on the basis of sex and race or ethnic origin.

Model projects on educational equity for disabled women and girls. This priority is intended to develop model programs and materials that address the educational needs of disabled women and seek to overcome barriers to their full participation in educational programs resulting from double discrimination, bias, and stereotyping based on sex and disability.

Model projects to influence leaders in educational policy and administration. These projects are intended to increase the commitment to title IX compliance and to educational equity for women among individuals and organizations that affect the development and implementation of education policy.

Model projects to eliminate persistent barriers to educational equity for women. This priority is intended to support projects that focus on critical issues related to intractable institutional or attitudinal barriers to the achievement of equity in areas where little change has occurred, such as physical education, vocational education, or educational administration.

The regulations also provide that funds may be awarded for "other authorized activities" related to educational equity for women and girls which are not included under one of the specific priorities.

Funding priorities in fiscal years 1981 and 1982

The Secretary selects one or more priorities for funding for each fiscal year's grant competition and determines the approximate percentage of available funds that will be awarded under each priority.

Before the fiscal year 1981 grant competition, the Secretary published a Notice of Proposed Annual Program Priorities in the September 26, 1980, Federal Register to solicit public comments on which priorities should be selected for funding and what percentage of available funds should be allocated to each priority. Based on analyses of the comments, the Secretary selected five priorities for funding in fiscal year 1981.

According to WEEAP officials, the Secretary did not publish a Notice of Proposed Annual Program Priorities for fiscal year 1982 because of time constraints. We were told that the selection of priorities in 1982 was based on (1) a review of grant applications received in the prior year and (2) the WEEAP staff's knowledge of the needs in the various priority areas.

The selected priorities and the percentage of funds allocated to each in fiscal years 1981 and 1982 are shown in the following table.

Priority	Percent 1981	Percent 1982
Projects to achieve title IX compliance	30	30
Equity for racial and ethnic minority women	40	30
Equity for disabled women and girls	15	15
Projects to influence leaders in educational policy and administration	10	10
Projects to eliminate persistent barriers to educational equity	-	15
Other authorized activities	5	-
Total	100	100

Recruiting potential field readers

For fiscal year 1981, the WEEAP staff recruited field readers to review grant applications. For fiscal year 1982, although the WEEAP staff continued to recruit potential field readers, most readers were identified through the Field Reader Outreach Program--a new program administered by ED's Office of the Deputy Under Secretary for Management.

Fiscal year 1981

In preparation for the 1981 grant competition, the WEEAP staff recruited field readers. According to the WEEAP director, recruitment was informal and unsystematic. During speeches before educational organizations, at meetings and conferences, and in media interviews, the director and her staff discussed the program's need for field readers and requested that interested individuals submit resumes. Occasionally, organizations to which they spoke published notices in their internal publications announcing WEEAP's need for readers. The WEEAP staff also requested field reader recommendations or resumes from other ED offices, the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, and former grantees. The staff also received unsolicited resumes following the annual Federal Register announcement of the WEEAP grant competition.

The director said that before the 1981 grant competition WEEAP identified and obtained information on about 300 potential field readers.

Fiscal year 1982

In preparation for the 1982 competition, the WEEAP staff recruited readers as described above. Their efforts identified about 100 additional potential readers, bringing the pool of potential readers to 400.

In 1982, the Field Reader Outreach Program identified about 200 additional potential readers for WEEAP. ED established the Outreach Program to broaden and update the pool of qualified field readers. Readers were identified and recruited for all ED programs needing field readers through solicitation efforts conducted by (1) Assistant Secretaries and other senior officials, (2) the Secretary's 10 regional representatives, and (3) several research organizations, including the Heritage Foundation and the Conservative Caucus. The Deputy Under Secretary for Management characterized the research organizations as being "conservative."

According to ED officials who helped establish the Outreach Program, there was concern in ED that the same field readers were being used year after year, that these readers exhibited a "liberal" bias, and that they had become a part of the programs' "networks," thus minimizing the independence of the field reader evaluation process. We were told that ED attempted, through the Outreach Program, to solicit new readers with "conservative" philosophies and to give more responsibility to Assistant Secretaries and other senior officials in selecting field readers. (For additional information on the Outreach Program, see app. III.)

Selecting field readers

In 1981 WEEAP selected its field readers from the pool of individuals solicited by the program's staff. In 1982, officials from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education selected readers for WEEAP from the names obtained through the Outreach Program.

Fiscal year 1981

WEEAP maintains a file for each potential reader which includes his/her name, address, social security number, sex, race/ethnicity, occupation, employer, educational level, and professional background. According to the WEEAP director, before the 1981 competition the information maintained on prospective field readers was reviewed by the program staff. Each staff member recommended to the director the individuals that he/she felt were qualified to read grant applications and justified the recommendations.

According to the director and her staff, they recommended individuals who met all the field reader selection criteria outlined in the technical review plan. These criteria include:

1. Commitment to the provision of educational equity for women and girls and knowledge and experience in issues relating to educational equity. (See page 3 for a definition of women's educational equity.)

2. Expertise in one or more of the WEEAP funding priorities.

3. Expertise in one of the following education-related areas:

   --Educational administration.

   --Curricula, textbooks, and materials development.

--Training of educational personnel.

--Career education.

--Vocational education.

--Counseling and guidance.

--Education for adult women.

--Physical education.

--Racism and sexism in education.

--Education of disabled girls and women.

--Strategies for change, including networking, organizing, and organizational development.

The WEEAP director said that individuals were invited to participate as field readers based on (1) the staff's recommendations and (2) the requirement in the technical review plan that there be diversity among readers in terms of race, sex, age, geographical location, educational background, and institutional affiliation.

After making the selections, the WEEAP staff sent each individual an invitation letter, a resume form, an "Absence of Conflict of Interest" form, WEEAP regulations, and other pertinent material. The invitation letter asked invitees to immediately contact the WEEAP staff if they could participate in the grant reading session and to complete and return the required forms. The letter was tentative since it cautioned:

> "* * * It is possible that we will receive fewer applications than expected; in that event, we will not need as many panelists as we now anticipate and therefore may be unable to invite you to participate * * *."

The WEEAP director made the final selection of readers after most grant applications were received and most invitees had responded. Delaying final selection in this way enabled the director to select readers in accordance with the number and type of applications received.

According to the director, the final selection of field readers was partially based on the need to diversify the group and also to adhere to an ED requirement that not more than 67 percent of the current year's readers be the same as the prior year's.

The director said that individuals were assigned to panels based on their expertise in the priority in which they would be evaluating grant applications. There were three individuals on each panel and enough panels so that each would review between 30 and 40 applications. The director attempted to diversify panels in terms of race/ethnicity, age, level of education, and type of employer/institutional affiliation. Reviewers from the same organization were not assigned to the same panel, nor did they review applications under the same priority. Applications were assigned to panels by block (i.e., applications numbered 1 through 30 were assigned to panel one, those numbered 31 through 60 were assigned to panel two, etc.).

Fiscal year 1982

Initially the 1982 field reader selection process progressed in a manner similar to that indicated above, that is, the WEEAP staff completed their review of about 400 files maintained in the program office, selected 185 potential readers, sent the invitation letters, and were reviewing resumes received from the Field Reader Outreach Program to identify additional invitees. However, at this point, the Acting Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education instructed the WEEAP director to select all 1982 field readers from the resumes obtained through the Outreach Program.

The Acting Assistant Secretary said this decision was made to recognize ED's recruitment efforts and obtain new and "more objective" readers. According to her, the Outreach Program's pool of readers more broadly represented the needs of women than did WEEAP's pool. The Acting Assistant Secretary stated that she did not agree with WEEAP's past selection of readers, whom she categorized generally as "feminists," and that other individuals--including teachers, homemakers, PTA members, church members, and community volunteers--can also be committed to educational equity and should be given the opportunity to serve as field readers.

After the decision was made to use only readers solicited through the Outreach Program, the WEEAP staff completed their review of 184 resumes referred by the Outreach Program and notified the Office of the Assistant Secretary that they had identified 44 individuals who they believed were qualified to read.

At this point the WEEAP director was detailed for 90 days to another ED office to help review ED's internal control systems.

During the director's absence, the Acting Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education assumed the director's responsibilities. Staff from the Assistant Secretary's office (1) attempted to cancel the invitations previously sent by the director, (2) sent additional invitations and background material to 203 individuals whose resumes were obtained through the Outreach Program, (3) evaluated the resumes of those individuals who had indicated they were available to read, and (4) selected 48 readers to review 1982 grant applications.

According to the Special Assistant to the Acting Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, no attempt was made to screen individuals to determine if they met the selection criteria before sending each of the 203 individuals an invitation. However, the resumes of individuals who responded positively to the invitation were evaluated, and as a result, 48 readers were selected. The Special Assistant said he and another ED employee selected individuals whose resumes indicated that they had experience in one of the approved WEEAP funding priorities and/or expertise in 1 of the 11 educationally related areas. He said the selection criterion "Commitment to educational equity for women * * *" was subjective and difficult to apply and "commitment" was assumed if the individual had an understanding of one of the priority areas or indicated membership in a women's organization. According to the Special Assistant, political affiliation was not considered during the selection process, although many individuals included that information on their resumes. The officials also said they attempted to diversify the readers according to sex, race/ethnicity, and geographical location.

We were told that individuals were assigned to read applications in the priority area in which they had expertise and an attempt was made to maintain diversity among panel members in terms of ethnic background, gender, and geographic characteristics and that panels were structured so that readers did not review applications from institutions or individuals in their own State.

Fiscal year 1983

In 1983, WEEAP applications will be reviewed by one non-Federal and two Federal field readers. All readers will be approved by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education. Federal readers will be program officers of other programs under the jurisdiction of the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. Non-Federal readers will be identified through the Field Reader Outreach Program.

Characteristics of field readers

We reviewed the information on file for the 84 readers used in 1981 and the 55 readers used in 1982[1] to obtain information regarding sex, race/ethnicity, educational level, area of residence, and employment of readers and to determine if the 1981 and 1982 readers met the selection criteria in the technical review plans.

As shown in the table on page 13, there were significant differences between the 1981 and 1982 readers in terms of ethnicity, area of residence, and employment. Eighty percent of the readers were Black, Hispanic, Asian American, or Native American in 1981; 24 percent were from these groups in 1982. In 1982 the percentage of readers from the Southeast and Midwest increased, and the percentage from the Northeast decreased. In 1982, the percentage of readers employed by nonprofit organizations decreased, and the percentage of unemployed individuals and privately and self-employed individuals increased.

Based on our review of the field reader resumes, we determined that 1 (or 1 percent) of the 1981 readers and 11 (or 20 percent) of the 1982 readers did not meet any of the selection criteria. It should be noted, however, that the criteria are very subjective. For example, there is no clear definition of "commitment to the provision of educational equity." According to the WEEAP director, "commitment" is indicated if the resume shows that a reader has had experience in women's educational equity issues, has actively participated in organizations that promote women's educational equity, or has published literature regarding women's educational equity.

Similarly, the criterion calling for expertise does not state how recently the required expertise should have been acquired; therefore, we had to use our judgment in assessing certain situations. For example, one of the field readers was the president of a local board of education in 1971. We considered that service as giving her expertise in educational administration. Another reader's resume indicated that her only experience relating to the selection criteria outlined in the WEEAP technical review plan was her experience as a basketball coach in 1942. We did not believe that such service demonstrated expertise in physical education, 1 of the 11 areas of expertise outlined in the technical plan.

---

[1] Six individuals invited by WEEAP were not informed that their invitations were canceled, reported, and were permitted to read.

Demographic Information
1981 and 1982 WEEAP Field Readers

	Percent	
	1981	1982 (note a)
Sex:		
Female	86	87
Male	14	13
Ethnicity:		
Black	25	15
Hispanic	19	7
Asian American	19	-
Native American	17	2
White	20	76
Area of residence:		
Midwest	11	33
Northeast	40	11
Southeast	11	22
Northwest	5	4
Southwest	33	30
Educational level (note b):		
Doctorate	40	27
Masters	40	36
Undergraduate	10	16
Associate	2	4
Not indicated	7	16
Employer:		
Institution of higher learning	38	31
State or local education agency	18	20
Nonprofit organization	18	5
Private or self-employed	19	29
Federal Government	6	-
Unemployed (note c)	1	15

a/Includes six readers invited by WEEAP who were not notified that their invitations were canceled, reported, and were permitted to read.

b/Percentages may not add due to rounding.

c/If the individual did not indicate a current employer, we considered him/her unemployed.

Schedules showing the educational background, employment history, and organizational affiliations of the 1981 and 1982 readers are in appendixes IV and V.

Conducting the grant reading session

The 1981 grant reading session was held in Washington, D.C., from February 23 to 27, 1981. At that time 824 proposals were read by 84 readers in 28 panels. The WEEAP director and six WEEAP staff members served as panel monitors, each monitoring four panels.

On the session's first day, the WEEAP director conducted a 4-hour orientation session for readers during which she discussed WEEAP's purpose, the applicable regulations, the scoring process, and the necessity for field readers to provide an independent review. She also explained how proposals were ranked and how award decisions were made. Readers were also given another copy of the information package which had been mailed to them with their invitation letter.

After the director's orientation, the monitors met with their panels to discuss the reading process and to reiterate, if necessary, information presented during the orientation. During the balance of the week, readers reviewed and scored applications using an application review form which listed the selection criteria in the WEEAP regulations. The criteria include:

--The need for and impact of the project (24 points).

--The extent to which the project establishes objectives that meet the identified needs and describes a realistic approach to achieving the objectives (16 points).

--The quality of the application plan of operation (10 points).

--The applicant's commitment to educational equity for women (10 points).

--The qualifications of the project staff (10 points).

--The extent to which the project employs a new or innovative approach to achieving educational equity for women (5 points) (small grants only).

Readers used the application review form to record their numerical scores and narrative comments supporting those scores.

The 1982 grant reading session was held in Silver Spring, Maryland, from May 17 to 21, 1982. Fifty-four[2] readers were assigned to 18 panels and read 528 applications. Five WEEAP staffmembers served as panel monitors, each monitoring three or four panels.

The first day orientation session was given by staff from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education. The orientation lasted about 1 hour, during which the representatives discussed priority and panel assignments, use of the application review forms in scoring proposals, conflicts of interest, and ED's policies for reimbursing field readers for their time and travel expenses. The representatives also informed the readers that information in the applications was confidential and should not be discussed outside of each panel. In addition, the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary told readers that the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education anticipated that WEEAP would not be funded in fiscal year 1983. (The administration's fiscal year 1983 budget did not request such funding.) She requested that readers evaluate applications based on whether the objectives could be achieved with 1 year of funding.

After the initial session, the readers formed into panels, and each panel monitor continued the orientation. Several panel monitors said that no instructions were given concerning topics to cover during the panel orientations; consequently, the content of the sessions differed among panels. Some monitors gave the panelists time to read the program regulations and ask questions; others attempted a more in-depth description of the evaluation criteria and scoring procedures. Readers scored applications using the application review forms described previously. Each panel read between 17 and 43 applications.

Ranking and selecting applications for funding

In both 1981 and 1982 the readers' scores were submitted to ED's Assistance Management and Procurement Service, which standardized[3] and averaged the scores. The Service then ranked the applications under general and small grant categories in each priority according to the average standardized score and sent the rank order listing to the program office.

---

[2] Another individual read for 1 day, then resigned.

[3] Standardization is a computer-assisted statistical procedure which minimizes the tendency of some readers to score applications consistently high or consistently low.

In 1981 the WEEAP staff selected applications for funding based on the rank order listing as well as the "additional award decision criteria." As a result, applications for most priorities were not funded in rank order. In 1982 the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education funded applications in strict rank order.

Fiscal year 1981

WEEAP regulations state that in addition to the rank order listing, applications for funding should also be selected on the basis of "additional award decision criteria." These criteria provide that consideration be given to the following:

--The need to avoid duplication of projects that have already been funded.

--The need for geographic distribution of projects throughout the Nation.

--The need for projects that collectively

(1) address the diverse needs of women among various population groups;

(2) address all levels of education, including preschool, elementary and secondary education, higher education, and adult education;

(3) use a variety of strategies for assessing needs; and

(4) include a variety of grantees, such as community, student, and women's organizations, including those that have a substantial membership of minority or disabled women.

In 1981 WEEAP initially proposed to fund 33 applications (indicated by a "P" in the following table). ED policy requires that justifications, based on the award decision criteria, be provided when an application is proposed for funding before a higher ranked one. WEEAP justified not recommending the higher ranked applications because they duplicated previously funded projects or duplicated projects that were proposed for funding under another priority in the current year. WEEAP justified recommending the 38th and 51st ranked applications under "Equity for Racial/Ethnic Minority Women" and the 9th ranked application under "Projects to Influence Leaders" based on the "award decision criteria" requiring support for different types of grantees--each was the highest ranked application in its priority from an Indian tribe, a Black college, and a minority organization.

Initial recommendations were based on the presumed availability of $2.5 million for new grants. However, because of budget changes, only about $1.0 million eventually became available. Accordingly, WEEAP developed new funding recommendations based on the revised amount available (indicated by an "F" in the table). The revised recommendations were approved, and the 21 grants were funded.

1981 WEEAP Funding

Rank	Title IX compliance		Equity for racial/ethnic minority women		Equity for disabled women		Projects to influence leaders		Other authorized activities	
	G	S	G	S	G	S	G	S	G	S
1	P	PF	P		P		PF		PF	
2	PF		PF	PF	P		PF			
3	PF		PF	PF						
4		PF		PF	PF		P		PF	
5				PF						
6		PF	PF							
7	P									
8			PF	PF						
9	P		P					PF		
10	PF		P							
11										
12	P									
13-37										
38			P							
39-50										
51			P							

P = proposed for funding
G = general grant
S = small grant
F = revised recommendation (funded)

Denials of funds for high-ranked applications originally proposed for funding were justified on the basis that further review showed that the project (1) duplicated a previously funded project, (2) was a continuation of a previously funded project, (3) was not cost effective, or (4) did not develop a model project as required by the WEEAP regulations. For example, one justification stated:

> "The proposed project is entitled P.O.W.E.R. II (Production of Women's Educational Resources) and is, in fact, an expansion and continuation of an earlier WEEA grant awarded to this applicant in FY 1978. This project was very highly ranked by the three field readers who evaluated the application. Because it ranked first of 268 applications, it was proposed for funding originally, despite the fact that the proposed project is, in essence, a continuation of the earlier project. Field readers, of course, are not expected to know about all previously funded WEEA projects, nor are they permitted to apply the award decision criterion which requires the WEEAP Program to 'avoid duplication of previously funded projects.' Because funds now are severely limited, it would not be cost-effective to use available funds for a project which duplicates an earlier (albeit successful) model."

Another stated:

> "Although this project is an excellant [sic] one and would develop a useful model of interinstitutional collaboration of minority women, its proposed cost far exceeds its value as a model. In fact, similar (though not identical) models now exist and could be modified and replicated for use with the project's target population at a much lower cost. This project was proposed for funding, although it does duplicate several aspects of previously funded projects, because it would address several issues on interinstitutional collaboration which WEEA has not yet addressed and it would support a program of education for low income Black women. Because funds now are severely limited, it would not

be cost-effective to fund a project at this level ($111,880), with limited focus and applicability."

We asked the WEEAP director why high-ranked applications originally proposed for funding were now denied funding on the basis that they duplicated previously funded proposals (i.e., all duplicates should have been denied funding originally based on application of the award decision criteria). She said that in 1980 and 1981 it was the policy of the Assistant Secretary to fund the top-ranked general grants regardless of whether they duplicated a previously funded project. No written justifications were given for not funding the seventh and ninth ranked grants under the "Title IX Compliance" priority.

Fiscal year 1982

In 1982 representatives of the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education funded applications in strict rank order as shown in the following table.

1982 WEEAP Funding

Rank	Title IX compliance		Equity for racial/ ethnic minorities		Equity for disabled women		Projects to influence leaders		Eliminate persistent barriers	
	G	S	G	S	G	S	G	S	G	S
1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2	_	X	X	X	_	_	_	X	_	X
	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	2

X=funded

Determining final funding amounts

Final funding amounts are determined through a process involving the program staff, the Assistant Secretary, the grants officer, and the applicant. Initially the WEEAP staffmember designated as project officer reviews the application and related budget to determine if costs and expenses are reasonable and allowable under the program regulations. Based on this review the project officer prepares a recommended budget (which may differ from the applicant's proposed budget) and submits it through the program director to the Assistant Secretary for approval. After approval, the budget is submitted to the grants officer, who reviews the application and related budget and determines if costs and expenses are allowable under the program regulations and under ED General Grant Regulations (34 C.F.R. part 74). After any differences between the project officer and the grants officer are resolved, the two jointly contact the applicant and negotiate the final award amount.

Funding patterns were similar in 1981 and 1982. In both years relatively few new grants, measured as a percentage of applications, were awarded. Of the new grants that were awarded, most received more than 90 percent of the amount requested, as shown in the following table.

Summary of WEEAP
Discretionary Grant Funding (note a)

Type of application	Applications read	Grants awarded No.	Grants awarded Percent	Funding percentage (note b) Below 50	50-74	75-90	91-99	100 or more
1981								
General	632	12	(1.9)	1	-	3	3	5
Small	192	9	(4.7)	-	-	-	2	7
	824	21	(2.5)	1	-	3	5	12
1982								
General	429	6	(1.4)	-	-	2	3	1
Small	99	9	(9.1)	-	1	-	3	5
	528	15	(2.8)	-	1	2	6	6

a/Does not include one general grant which was reviewed in 1980, but not funded in 1980 because of an oversight. The grant was funded in 1981 at 110 percent of the amount requested.

b/Funding percentages are based on a comparison of the amount initially requested and the amount finally awarded.

In 1981, 7 of the 13 new general grants were for projects covering more than 1 year; in 1982, none of the new grants were multiyear awards. (As indicated earlier the administration's budget for 1983 did not contain a request for funding for WEEAP.) Because multiyear grants were not made in 1982 and because 1982 is the final year of all previously awarded grants and contracts, the entire WEEAP appropriation ($5.7 million) will be available for new awards in 1983.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

NIE was established on June 23, 1972, by the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221(e)) to conduct and support research, development, and dissemination activities that promote educational equity and improve the quality of educational practice. The act authorizes NIE to conduct its activities and achieve its objectives through a program of contracts and grants to qualified public and private agencies and individuals.

NIE supports research projects through discretionary grants in three discrete program areas:

--Through the Teaching and Learning Program, NIE seeks to improve reading, writing, and other essential skills. It awards grants to support research on such topics as language, mathematics learning, basic cognitive skills, teaching in school settings, and testing and evaluation.

--Through the Educational Policy and Organization Program, NIE supports research on such issues as organization, management, law, finance, and government in education. Research activities include increasing equity in financing education, improving the organization and management of educational institutions and their relationships with the communities they serve, and examining how Federal, State, and local educational policy is developed and implemented.

--Through the Dissemination and Improvement of Practice Program, NIE attempts to increase the availability and effective use of new knowledge by policymakers, teachers, and administrators, in order to improve local educational practice. The program promotes regional approaches for improving educational practice, supports research in the dissemination and use of knowledge for improving the quality of education, and maintains the NIE Library and the Educational Resource Information Center, which is considered to be the leading educational information system in the world.

NIE also awards discretionary grants under its Unsolicited Proposal Program, through which it seeks to encourage eligible individuals and groups to develop unique ideas relevant to NIE's mission. NIE established an agencywide system for review of unsolicited proposals in 1977 following a recommendation by the National Council on Educational Research, NIE's policymaking body, that NIE allocate 3 to 5 percent of its budget to fund unsolicited proposals. Our work at NIE was limited to a review of the Unsolicited Proposal Program.

While unsolicited proposals may address an ED or NIE priority, the Unsolicited Proposal Program does not have its own specific funding priorities. NIE accepts unsolicited proposals at any time, but consolidates them for competitive review.

Unsolicited proposals are read by outside experts--referred to as reviewers rather than field readers--who score the proposals according to preestablished criteria. The NIE Director selects proposals for funding after reviewing the reviewers' scores and the NIE staff's funding recommendations. The grants are monitored by staffs of the three discrete program areas.

The Unsolicited Proposal Program is directed by a coordinator, who is assisted by a liaison from each of the three program areas and one or two representatives from the NIE Director's office.

In fiscal year 1981, NIE funded five new unsolicited proposals totaling about $320,000. In 1982, NIE selected 17 new proposals; as of February 1983, 15 had been funded at a total of about $1 million.

Legislation, Department regulations, and program directives

In addition to the General Education Provisions Act, NIE's Unsolicited Proposal Program is governed by:

--ED General Administrative Regulations.

--ED General Grant Regulations.

--Unsolicited Proposal Program Regulations.

--Department of Health and Human Services Grants Administration Manual.

--Various NIE implementing directives.

Each of these regulations or directives is discussed briefly in appendix II.

Selecting reviewers

NIE selected reviewers in a different manner in 1981 and 1982. In 1981, as in previous years, staff from the three program areas independently selected reviewers to review unsolicited proposals assigned to their areas. In 1982 the NIE Director required program staff to select a portion of the reviewers from a list of names compiled by the Office of the Director.

Fiscal year 1981

In 1981, unsolicited proposals were assigned to the program areas to which they were most closely related. Program staff read the proposals for content and identified the type of reviewers needed in terms of technical expertise, research background, and field of specialization. Program staff then tailored the selection of reviewers to the proposals. In addition, according to program staff, in 1981, in accordance with NIE policy, staff made an attempt to select reviewers balanced by sex, race/ethnicity, and occupation, that is, practitioner or researcher.

Although there were no formal recruiting efforts, staff-members said they identified potential reviewers based on their knowledge of experts in the field addressed by the proposal or obtained recommendations and input from

--major associations in education and related fields;

--directories of prominent researchers, educators, and other specialists;

--current and former reviewers;

--past recipients of NIE grants;

--professional colleagues outside of NIE;

--NIE program staff, most of whom have research backgrounds in education and related fields;

--other researchers in education and related fields; and

--unsolicited resumes from individuals who wanted to serve as reviewers.

In addition, a few individuals were nominated by the Director.

Program staff prepared a one-page information sheet containing some or all of the following information on each reviewer: (1) name, (2) gender, (3) race/ethnicity, (4) organizational affiliation, (5) area of expertise, and (6) whether the individual is a practitioner or researcher. Program staff said they had personal knowledge of the individuals or obtained the information from available resumes, other program staff, material published by the reviewer, or telephone calls to the potential reviewers. The information was used to verify compliance with an NIE policy, established in 1979, that reviewers show a balance by gender, race/ethnicity, and occupation, that is, practitioner or researcher.

Fiscal year 1982

In preparation for the 1982 competition, program staff began selecting reviewers in the manner described above. However, when program staff were ready to invite selected individuals, they were notified that the Director's office would select 1982 reviewers. The Director later modified this policy to require program staff to select a portion of the reviewers from a list of names compiled by the Director's office. According to the then Deputy Director of NIE, who helped establish the selection policy, the intent was to broaden the pool of reviewers and to recruit readers who would give a "fresh look to what taxpayers are spending their money on."

The Deputy Director said the policy was developed because he believed the same people were being used year after year and had become part of the "old boys' network." He said that he did not believe nor did he ever receive complaints that previous readers were unqualified. Yet, he said he believed reviewers influence the "philosophy" of what gets funded and, if the same reviewers were used repeatedly, the potential existed for the same types of proposals to be funded. However, he had no indication that the same types of proposals had been funded.

Two officials in the Director's office recruited new reviewers, including personal and professional contacts--such as college and university professors and economists, or individuals recommended by them. Based upon telephone conversations with prospective reviewers, the officials recorded each individual's institutional affiliation and area of expertise on an information sheet. According to one of the officials, about half of the individuals also sent their vitae to NIE.

The Director's office sought to recruit reviewers who had not reviewed NIE proposals in the past and who had knowledge of the field. According to the then Deputy Director, the subject matter of unsolicited proposals was so broad and diverse that reviewers needed only "common sense."

One official responsible for recruiting reviewers said that he "did not remember" the Director requesting him to seek peer reviewers with a particular ideology. In 1982 the Director's office neither sought ethnic or gender balance or balance in terms of practitioners and researchers in recruiting reviewers nor required program staff to select reviewers representative of ethnicity, gender, or occupation.

The Office of the Director gave the information sheets and/or vitae to the Unsolicited Proposal Program coordinator, who reviewed the information to determine the program area for which the individuals were most qualified to read. He, in turn, referred the information for 82 individuals to the Teaching and Learning Program area and that for 37 individuals to the Educational Policy and Organization Program area. Information on all 119 was sent to the staff of the Dissemination and Improvement of Practice Program area.

To assure that program staff would use individuals recommended by the Director's office, the Director required each program area to use each individual from his list at least once, to assign one of these individuals to each proposal, and to use these individuals for at least 50 percent of all the reviews.

Several program officials responsible for selecting reviewers objected to the new selection requirements for one or more of the following reasons:

--Information provided by the Director's office was, in some cases, insufficient to adequately assess the qualifications.

--Available information indicated that some reviewers lacked educational research backgrounds or were otherwise unqualified to review research proposals.

--The selection process prevented program staff from tailoring selections of reviewers to the proposals' subject matter as they had done in previous years. Instead, staff had to match proposals to reviewers, which hampered their ability to select three maximally qualified individuals to review each proposal.

--For some proposals no individual on the Director's list had the necessary expertise.

--In their opinion program staff are better able to find qualified reviewers because of their understanding of research areas and their knowledge of experts in the field.

--Many resumes provided by the Director's office contained information on individuals' political affiliations and activities, yet such information had never previously been included in resumes. As a result, staff felt they were being pressured to select reviewers on the basis of political affiliation or ideology rather than technical competence.

Program staff were initially instructed to use all the individuals on the Director's list; however, because staff found that some of the individuals were either unavailable or appeared unqualified, ultimately the Director made exceptions to the requirement so that all the individuals from the list did not have to be selected. Program staff said that they attempted to comply with the Director's policy by selecting the most qualified individuals from the Director's list and assigning them to review several proposals. For example, of reviewers selected from the Director's list to read proposals relating to reading and language, six were assigned to read five or six proposals each--for a total of 33 proposals. By comparison, 13 were assigned to read one proposal each.

Of the 119 individuals recommended by the Director's office, 96 were used to review unsolicited proposals. This represented about one-third of the 272 reviewers used in 1982. According to the Unsolicited Proposal coordinator and program staff, about 50 percent of the reviews were conducted by individuals from the Director's list. Program staff selected the remaining reviewers independently as they had done in previous years.

Although NIE received 334 referrals from the Field Reader Outreach Program, none were used because NIE had already begun selecting reviewers. (For additional information on the Outreach Program, see app. III.)

Fiscal Year 1983

According to the Unsolicited Proposal Program coordinator, 1983 reviewers will be identified and selected independently by the staffs of the three discrete programs as was done for the 1981 competition.

Characteristics of reviewers

To obtain information on the gender and race/ethnicity of 1981 and 1982 reviewers and to determine whether reviewers had knowledge or experience in educational research, we randomly selected and reviewed the information sheets, vitae, and/or other information on file for 50 of the 205 reviewers used in 1981 and 60 of the 272 reviewers used in 1982.

Gender, race/ethnicity

We estimate that information on ethnicity was not available for 16 (or 8 percent) of the 205 reviewers used in 1981. Of the other 189 reviewers we estimate that 32 percent were Black, Hispanic, Asian American, or Native American. We estimate that in 1982 information on ethnicity was not available for 27 (or 10 percent) of the 272 reviewers, and of the other 245 reviewers, 15 percent were from the above groups. We estimate that in 1981, 46 percent of NIE's reviewers were women and 54 percent were men; in 1982, the number of women reviewers declined by 11 percent.

Sex, Race/Ethnicity of Reviewers Used for the NIE Unsolicited Proposal Program in 1981 and 1982 (note a)

	1981	1982
Ethnicity:		
Black	18	8
Hispanic	10	2
Asian American	4	5
Native American	-	-
White	60	75
Information not available	8	10
Sex:		
Female	46	35
Male	54	65

a/Sampling errors are available on request.

Educational researchers and practitioners

NIE officials attempted to select as reviewers researchers and practitioners who had knowledge of the subject matter of the proposal. There are no written selection criteria; however, according to definitions accepted by all three program areas, an educational researcher's primary current responsibility is the creation of knowledge and understanding in a particular area and at a specific level and with methodologies appropriate to the grants competition. Such experience qualifies the researcher to judge fairly whether the research design, methods, measures, and analysis contained in the proposal will be instrumental in addressing the educational problems under study.

A practitioner is an individual whose primary current responsibility is the delivery of educational services in an area and at a level appropriate to the competition, which qualifies him/her to identify the most educationally significant problems addressed in the proposals. In addition, practitioners must be able to understand issues of research design, methodology, measures, and analyses in order to judge fairly whether the research proposal will be instrumental in addressing the educational problems identified.

The common element in each definition is an understanding of educational research. In the former case, the individual must currently perform educational research; in the latter, the individual must be able to understand issues of research design, methodology, measures, and analyses.

We reviewed the information available for each reviewer in our sample to determine if the individual possessed experience in or knowledge of educational research. We considered an individual's academic training, occupation, and institutional affiliation as they related to NIE research topics, and professional accomplishments, such as published books or journal articles on education-related issues.

In 1981, we estimate that sufficient information was not available for 53 (or 26 percent) of the 205 reviewers to permit us to make a determination. All of the other 152 reviewers, in our estimation, had experience in or knowledge of educational research. We estimate that in 1982 sufficient information was not available for 32 (or 12 percent) of the 272 reviewers to permit us to make a determination. Of the other 240 reviewers, we estimate that 231 (or 96 percent) had experience in or knowledge of educational research and 9 (or 4 percent) did not. However, because the percentages were generated from sampled data and have an associated sampling error, the two populations are not statistically different and the two groups have basically the same characteristics. We did not attempt to determine if each reviewer had knowledge and experience in the area addressed by the proposal(s) he or she reviewed.

Evaluation of proposals

In 1981 proposals were reviewed in two stages: (1) each eligible proposal was mailed to and read by three reviewers in the field and (2) higher rated proposals were later evaluated by review panels. The panels, composed of three to four reviewers, convened in Washington, D.C., for 2 days. In addition to evaluating each proposal, panel members recommended whether or not to fund it. NIE used both field reviewers and panels to increase the objectivity of the review process, which, in turn, might help deflect complaints from unsuccessful applicants. In 1982, to reduce costs, proposals were reviewed by field reviewers only, and panels were not used.

In 1981 NIE contracted with a firm to provide logistical services and other assistance in preparing for and conducting the grants competition. The firm mailed to reviewers proposals and review packages. The review package contained (1) a review sheet for each proposal, (2) a letter outlining instructions, rules, regulations, and deadlines, (3) an Unsolicited Proposal Information Statement, and (4) a field reviewer payment voucher. In addition the reviewer was asked to sign a field reviewer contract certifying that he/she did not have a conflict of interest.

Reviewers rated proposals according to five criteria published in the regulations:

--Significance of the proposed research for American education.

--Quality of the proposed research project.

--Qualifications of the principal investigator and other professional personnel.

--Adequacy of the facilities and arrangements available to the investigator(s) to conduct the proposed study.

--Reasonableness of the budget for the work to be done and the anticipated results.

Reviewers wrote comments, describing the proposals' strengths and weaknesses, and assigned a score for each criterion. The maximum score possible for each proposal was 100. Reviewers were instructed that:

1. A score of 90 or more indicates that the proposal is probably among the top 10 percent of the proposals submitted and that you strongly urge support.

2. A score of 80-89 indicates that the proposal is probably among the top third of the proposals submitted and that you recommend support.

3. A score of 60-79 indicates that the proposal is probably among the middle third of the proposals submitted and that you recommend support if funds are available.

Field reviewers were given 2 to 3 weeks to complete their reviews. They returned their review sheets to the contracting firm, which computed an interim score by dropping the lowest score and averaging the two others. Proposals which received an average score of at least 80, after the lowest score was dropped, were referred for panel review.

NIE procedures allow the Director or program staff to make exceptions when they believe the arbitrary cutoff score of 80 excluded worthwhile proposals. NIE permitted eight proposals with average scores of less than 80 to be reviewed by panels. For example, according to the Unsolicited Proposal coordinator, one proposal with an average score of less than 80 was not eliminated as a courtesy to the "nationally reputable" education association that submitted the proposal. None of these eight proposals were funded. One other proposal was not reviewed by any field reviewers because of an administrative oversight. This proposal was sent for panel review and was eventually funded. In 1981, of 137 eligible proposals reviewed by field reviewers, 78 (or 56 percent) were further reviewed by panelists.

Conducting the 1981 panel sessions

To save time, the contracting firm sent the reviewer contracts, proposals, and field reviewers' comments on the proposals to panelists about 3 to 4 weeks before the panel.session. Panels convened in Washington, D.C., on July 16 and 17, 1981, to rate the proposals.

Three or four reviewers served on each of eight panels, divided by program area. Five panels reviewed proposals relating to the Teaching and Learning Program area, two panels reviewed proposals relating to the Educational Policy and Organization Program area, and one panel reviewed proposals relating to the Dissemination and Improvement of Practice Program area.

On the first morning of the panel sessions, panelists received a 2-hour orientation, conducted by a member of the Director's office, the Unsolicited Proposal coordinator, and other NIE officials, who provided general information, instructions for evaluating proposals, procedures for selecting awards, and information on conflict of interest, freedom of information, and protection of confidentiality. NIE officials encouraged panelists to provide well-documented assessments of each proposal's strengths and weaknesses and to engage in group discussions in order to clarify individual judgments, rather than reach a consensus.

Program officials served as panel monitors. Their responsibilities included clarifying instructions, communicating panelists' concerns to the Unsolicited Proposal coordinator, and collecting and organizing panelists' scores. Monitors were not permitted to participate in the panelists' discussions, except to answer questions concerning the program areas' activities. Panelists rated proposals using the same criteria used by the field reviewers. They were given copies of the forms that had been completed by the field reviewers to consider during their evaluation.

In 1982 each proposal was reviewed by three or four reviewers in the field. To reduce costs NIE did not use review panels or a contractor.

Ranking and selecting proposals for funding

In accordance with ED regulations, NIE prepares a rank ordering of proposals based on the reviewers' scores. In 1981 panelists' scores were standardized,[4] and proposals were ranked overall and by program area, according to the average standardized score. In 1982, the field reviewers' scores were averaged, and proposals were ranked, by program area, according to the average score. Because the number of proposals read by each field reviewer was relatively small, standardizing scores was not statistically feasible.

The NIE Director makes the final selection of proposals to be funded after receiving recommendations from the program area staffs. The program staffs independently assess the research proposals. Based on their assessment and their review of the evaluations of field reviewers and/or panelists, the staffs recommend proposals for funding. Staffs also give the NIE Director suggested funding levels and rationales for their recommendations.

---

[4] If more than one panel is used, NIE regulations require that scores be standardized. Standardization is a statistical technique which minimizes the effect of some reviewers to score consistently high or consistently low.

In 1982, guidelines established by the Unsolicited Proposal Program required program staffs to eliminate from further consideration proposals receiving average scores of less than 80. However, in two cases program staffs recommended to the Director funding proposals which received average scores below 80. Of 20 proposals the Teaching and Learning Program area recommended for funding, 1 had received scores of 88, 88, and 59, which averaged 78.3. The proposal was not funded.

The Educational Policy and Organization Program area also recommended to the Director funding one proposal which received an average score below 80. The proposal had received field reviewer scores of 85, 80, and 50, which averaged 71.6. The proposal was eventually funded.

In addition, the NIE Director required five other proposals receiving average scores below 80 to be considered for funding. One which received an average score of 73.6 was funded.

The Director makes the final selection of proposals and sets the final funding level. NIE regulations state that in addition to considering reviewers' rankings and the staffs' recommendations, the Director, in making award decisions, will consider the extent to which

--the proposal addresses NIE's mission, which includes promoting educational equity and advancing educational practice;

--the proposal represents a unique opportunity for use of resources or conditions to conduct research or development with potential for important advancement in knowledge;

--the proposal addresses an ED priority in a more promising way than already planned work or by complementing planned work with an alternative approach to the problem; or

--the applicant, if a former grantee, complied with the requirements applicable to the prior award.

To the extent that the Director's order of approved proposals is different from the reviewers' rank order, NIE policy requires the Director to justify the deviation in writing.

In 1981 the Director selected five proposals for funding. These included the first and fourth ranked proposals in the Teaching and Learning Program area, the fourth and seventh ranked proposals in the Educational Policy and Organization Program area, and the second ranked proposal in the Dissemination and Improvement of Practice Program area. In relation to all 137 unsolicited proposals reviewed, the selected proposals ranked 3, 6, 15, 20, and 31. The Director justified funding proposals out of rank order on the basis that the proposals he selected supported NIE's mission or offered a unique opportunity for conducting research with potential for important advancement in knowledge.

In 1982, of 192 proposals reviewed, the Acting Director approved 17 for funding, including those ranked 2, 9, 13, 17, 20, 24, 27, and 46 in the Teaching and Learning Program area and those ranked 2, 6, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 26, and 27 in the Educational Policy and Organization Program area. In relation to all unsolicited proposals reviewed in 1982, the selected proposals ranked 2, 7, 12, 16, 19, 24, 26, 29, 33, 34, 40, 41, 42, 47, 71, 73, and 75.

The Acting Director justified selecting the 13 proposals that were not among NIE's top 17 ranked on the basis that 2 addressed an ED priority, 5 supported NIE's mission, and 9 offered a unique opportunity for research with potential for an important advancement of knowledge.[5]

Conversely, the Acting Director did not select 13 proposals that were among NIE's top 17 ranked; he justified 12 of the 13 deviations. According to the Unsolicited Proposal coordinator, one justification was omitted because of an administrative oversight. Of the 12 justifications provided, 6 were based on one or more of the stated criteria. In the six other cases, the justifications did not make specific reference to the criteria. Regarding these six cases, the Acting Director justified not selecting for funding NIE's fourth ranked proposal, entitled "A Developmental Study of Black English," because

---

[5] Numbers total more than 13 because, in some cases, the Acting Director provided more than 1 justification.

> "* * * it would be unwise for the Federal government to subsidize studies concerned with the hows and whys of non-standard English speech. Rather the Federal government should subsidize studies that help people to speak standard English."

In explaining why he did not select to fund the 13th ranked proposal, "Enduring Effects of Alternative Schools for Disruptive and Delinquent Students," he stated

> "* * * The subject matter was interesting. (Perhaps it could be funded by some research office in the Justice Department--which is not to say that it is not of significant interest in the field of education). NIE does not currently have a research area that this proposal fits into * * *"

The Acting Director also denied funding for the 5th, 10th, and 11th ranked applications proposing desegregation research, on the basis that

> "* * * during this round of unsolicited proposals the Institute is not funding any individual desegregation projects. * * * The Institute will hold a desegregation conference, and commission several papers during fiscal year 1983 to enable the Institute to survey the field's progress to date. * * *"

In the sixth case, the Acting Director denied funding for NIE's third ranked application, which proposed research on standardized test performance of learning disabled and behaviorally handicapped children. According to the staff's review of the proposal, the proposal was significant because of its intent to help emotionally disturbed and learning disabled children achieve better scores on standardized tests, which purportedly do not now accurately measure these students' intelligence. The Acting Director justified denying funding on the basis that

> "Too much time and effort nationwide have been spent in the area of 'Testmanship.' The primary purpose of standardized tests is indeed measuring how much a student knows about the particular content being tested. Nevertheless, the taking of tests does also measure a certain ability to focus one's attention, and to martial [sic] one's resources, and to plan the use of one's time.

> * * * The Federal government should not appear to be supporting the erasure of these elements from standardized tests, when in fact they have their proper place."

Determining final funding amounts

After reviewing each proposal's scope and related budget and the field reviewers' and/or panelists' comments on the budget, program staffs recommend funding levels to the Director. Final funding levels are approved by the Director after considering staff recommendations.

After the preparation of a Funds Commitment Request, authorizing the expenditure of funds at the level approved by the Director, the following steps are taken to negotiate the final award amount:

- --The responsible project officer notifies the applicant of the award selection and approved budget level. By telephone, the project officer and applicant discuss the substance and scope of the project and possible cost modifications.
- --Based upon this conversation and a subsequent letter from the project officer documenting the conversation, the applicant submits to the project officer and the responsible NIE grants officer a revised budget, if appropriate, and an up-to-date schedule and staffing plan.
- --After the project officer's technical review of the revised proposal and his/her recommendation to the Grants Office, the grants officer contacts the applicant for clarification of cost questions and final negotiations.

In 1981, of 137 proposals reviewed, 5 (or about 4 percent) were funded. One was funded at 100 percent of the amount requested, two at between 91 and 99 percent, one at between 50 and 74 percent, and one at below 50 percent.

In 1982, of 192 proposals read, 17 (or 8 percent) were approved for funding. Thirteen were funded at between 100 and 105 percent of the amount requested, one at between 91 and 99 percent, and one at between 75 and 90 percent. Two proposals approved by the Director pending fund availability had not been funded as of February 1983.

Out-of-cycle grants

In 1982, NIE funded two out-of-cycle unsolicited proposals totaling $75,059. Out-of-cycle proposals are proposals that, because of time factors unique to the proposed project, cannot be held for the next applicable competitive review, that is, "now-or-never" research projects.

NIE directives state that applications for projects with time constraints must be reviewed by an ad hoc review panel consisting of two NIE program officials and one grants officer. The directives state that the panel must submit to the Director, who makes the final decision, a written assessment of the application, addressing (1) whether the application qualifies as having a time constraint, (2) whether the application would receive favorable scores and comments if reviewed by reviewers in the program's next applicable competitive review, and (3) what impact funding the application would have on the program budget.

One of the two out-of-cycle proposals was submitted to NIE in April 1982, after the February 1982 deadline for receipt of unsolicited proposals. Because it was received by NIE before the 1982 unsolicited proposals were sent to field reviewers for review, the proposal was sent to three field reviewers and reviewed similarly to other unsolicited proposals. The application, which proposed collecting, organizing, and disseminating to States information pertaining to State policy and private education, received an average field reviewer score of 66. Program staff provisionally recommended funding the proposal. The proposal requested $105,378 in first year funds; NIE awarded $50,059.

The other out-of-cycle proposal was submitted in the form of a two-page letter to the NIE Acting Director. The September 7, 1982, letter proposed that NIE co-sponsor an October 25, 1982, regional conference for public and private sector educational policymakers on economic alternatives for education.

The proposal was reviewed by one grants officer and two program officials. In a September 15, 1982, memorandum to the Acting Director, the program officials recommended funding; accordingly, NIE awarded $25,000 to the applicant on September 24.

TALENT SEARCH

Talent Search, Upward Bound, Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, Education Opportunity Centers, and the Training Program for Special Programs Staff and Leadership Personnel are the five federally supported Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students (commonly referred to as the TRIO Programs). Upward Bound, the oldest of the programs, dates to the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act. Talent Search was established by the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The Higher Education Act Amendments of 1968 brought Talent Search and Upward Bound together in the U.S. Office of Education (now the Department of Education) and added the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students program, forming what came to be called TRIO. The addition of the Educational Opportunity Centers, by the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1972, rendered the TRIO label inappropriate and led to the new name of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students. In addition, the Education Amendments of 1976 added the training program for personnel of Special Programs projects. This training authority program was further modified by the Education Amendments of 1980. Nevertheless, the TRIO appellation is often used in reference to the Special Programs.

As indicated earlier our review was confined to the Talent Search Program. The program's purposes are:

> "* * * to identify qualified youth with potential for education at the postsecondary level and to encourage such youth to complete secondary school and to undertake a program of postsecondary education; to publicize the availability of student financial assistance available to persons who pursue a program of postsecondary education; and to encourage persons who have not completed programs of education at the secondary or postsecondary level, but who have the ability to complete such programs to reenter such programs. * * *"

The act authorizes the Secretary of Education to make grants and enter into contracts with institutions of higher education, public and private agencies, and, in exceptional circumstances, secondary schools for projects designed to achieve the program's objectives.

Talent Search projects must assure that two-thirds of the participants are low-income individuals who are first generation college students. Participants must have completed 6 years of elementary education or be between 12 and 27 years of age, and not have access to services of another Talent Search project.

In 1982, as in prior years, the Secretary conducted a grant competition to determine Talent Search projects to fund. Agencies, private organizations, higher education institutions, and secondary schools submitted applications to obtain funds for conducting such projects.

In 1982, each eligible application was reviewed by three field readers, who scored the proposal based on a set of pre-established evaluation criteria. The staff responsible for managing the program awarded additional points based on an evaluation of the applicant's experience in conducting Talent Search projects. Applications were ranked based on a composite of the field reader and staff scores. Applications were then funded, with limited exception, in rank order.

For fiscal year 1982, 167 projects were funded at a total cost of about $17.1 million.

The Talent Search Program is managed by the Division of Student Services, which is located in the Institutional Support Programs section under the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Higher Education in the Office of Postsecondary Education. DSS also manages the other TRIO programs.

Legislation, Department regulations, and program directives

In addition to the Higher Education Act of 1965, various Department regulations and departmental and program directives govern the operation of the Talent Search Program. These include the:

--ED General Administrative Regulations.

--Ed General Grant Regulations.

--Talent Search Program Regulations.

--Department of Health and Human Services Grants Administration Manual.

--Annual Talent Search Evaluation Plan.

Each of these regulations and policy guidelines is discussed briefly in appendix II.

Selecting field readers

DSS staff initially obtained the names of potential Talent Search readers from a computerized file of names maintained by the Office of Postsecondary Education. Each of the potential readers was contacted to determine his/her availability. A final selection of readers was made from those individuals who indicated they were interested and available to read. Final selections were made in accordance with criteria outlined in ED policy and program directives.

Field reader file

The Office of Postsecondary Education maintains a computerized file of 5,000 potential readers; of this number, about 1,700 are identified as potentially qualified to evaluate TRIO grant applications.

The file may include the individual's name, address, sex, race, ethnicity, current position and employer, prior position and employer, and educational background, including colleges or universities attended, fields of specialization, and degrees earned. It also includes the programs for which the individual is qualified to read grant applications.

A DSS official told us that the efforts to create the file began in fiscal year 1978, shortly after the reader selection and grant award process was transferred from ED's regional offices and centralized in headquarters. Initially the names of about 500 individuals who were recommended by the regional offices were included in the file. Additional names were obtained through a systematic recruitment effort during which DSS staff solicited recommendations for field readers from presidents of higher education institutions, regional program personnel, and former grant recipients. Between the initial effort and the 1982 Talent Search competition, there have been informal recruitment efforts, such as distributing resume forms at the grant sessions and requesting readers to recruit qualified colleagues. Unsolicited resumes are also received periodically from interested individuals.

Identifying field readers

In 1982 the names of 200 individuals were randomly selected by the computer from the file of individuals who were identified as qualified to read applications for Talent Search awards.

The 200 individuals were sent letters notifying them that they had been identified as potential field readers and requesting them to notify the DSS staff if they were available to read. Available readers were also requested to provide information on (1) gender and ethnicity, (2) current employment, (3) educational attainment, (4) professional experiences, and (5) prior service as a TRIO field reader. The information was used to update or augment the computerized file and to facilitate final selection of 1982 Talent Search readers.

Selecting field readers

Readers were selected from the group of individuals who indicated that they were available to read. Readers were selected based on the criteria delineated in the Talent Search Evaluation Plan, which among other things required:

--Each reader to have an undergraduate degree.

--Each reader to meet at least two of six "experience" criteria: (1) 2 or more years of secondary school experience, (2) 2 or more years of postsecondary experience, (3) working knowledge of the Talent Search program, (4) experience directing programs similar to Talent Search, (5) experience in working with disadvantaged youths or adults, and/or (6) experience in counseling or tutoring youths.

--Sixty percent of the readers to be employed by 2-year or 4-year institutions of higher education.

--Twenty percent of the readers to be employed by secondary schools.

--Twenty percent of the readers to be employed by public or private agencies or organizations.

--Fifty percent of the readers to be male and 50 percent female.

--The ethnic/racial distribution of readers to be in the same proportion as the ethnic/racial distribution of the individuals served through Talent Search projects in the most recent program year--43 percent Black, 30 percent White, 21 percent Hispanic, 4 percent Indian/ Alaska Native, and 3 percent Asian/Pacific Islander.[6]

--No more than 50 percent of the field readers to have read applications for Talent Search during the previous competition.

--The use of a field reader to be limited to no more than 2 successive years.

--An attempt to be made to maintain geographical distribution among readers.

The prior performance of the individual as a Talent Search field reader was also considered, when appropriate.

Invitations were sent to the selected readers specifying the scheduled dates and location of the 5-day grant review session and requesting invitees to advise DSS if they would be available to read on those dates. Invitees were also requested to read the material enclosed with the invitation before reporting to the grant reading session. The material included

--the application booklet,

--the program regulations,

--the Technical Review Form which would be used to evaluate applications,

--a conflict of interest form, and

--miscellaneous logistical information.

Subsequently, 14 individuals were referred by the Field Reader Outreach Program. One had been included in the computerized file and had been selected as a reader. The other 13 were not considered since their referral to the program office was made after the readers were selected. (For additional information on the Outreach Program, see app. III.)

---

[6] Percentages do not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

Assigning readers to panels and assigning applications to panels for review

Seventy-five readers were assigned to 25 panels. DSS tried to assign to each panel

--one man and one woman,

--one Black and one other minority,

--one White, and

--one experienced reader.

Reviewers were not permitted to review applications from their own institution, and reviewers from the same organization were not assigned to the same panel. Panels were constructed so that each panelist read from 9 to 12 applications. Most panels (18 of 25) read 11 applications.

DSS representatives said that applications were assigned so that each panel read applications from both former Talent Search grant recipients and from new applicants. Also, because applications differed significantly in length and complexity, DSS staff said they attempted to balance the workload among panels in terms of the length and complexity of applications read.

Fiscal Year 1983

DSS officials told us they had no plans to select 1983 readers, since there would be no competition for Talent Search grant awards and no new grants would be made in 1983.

Characteristics of field readers

Seventy-five readers were used for Talent Search in 1982. We reviewed the files for the 1982 field readers and developed information on the demographic characteristics of the group, which is summarized in the following table.

	Percent (note a)
Sex:	
Male	53
Female	47
Ethnicity:	
Black	45
White	32
Hispanic	16
Indian/Alaska Native	3
Asian/Pacific Islander	4
Area of residence:	
Northeast	32
Midwest	21
Southeast	16
Northwest	7
Southwest	25
Highest educational level attained:	
Doctorate	48
Masters	47
Undergraduate	5
Employer:	
Institutions of higher learning	65
Secondary schools	-
Agencies/organizations or self-employed	35

a/Percentages may not add due to rounding.

As requested, we also developed information on the sex and ethnicity of 1980 readers in order to compare the 1980 and 1982 readers in terms of these two characteristics. The information is presented in the following table.

	Percent	
	1980 (note a)	1982
Sex:		
Male	69	53
Female	31	47
Ethnicity:		
Black	29	45
White	57	32
Hispanic	11	16
Indian/Alaska Native	2	3
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	4

a/Percentages may not add due to rounding.

The 1980 Evaluation Plan was not as specific as the 1982 Plan regarding required gender and racial/ethnic diversity. The Plan, however, provided the following general criteria.

> "* * * Special programs serve a variety of clienteles and institutions and therefore the group of reviewers should reflect the characteristics of the population to be served, * * *.
>
> "Positive efforts will be made to insure that qualified minority and women reviewers * * * are given an equitable opportunity to participate in reviews."

Because of differing statements by individuals involved in selecting 1980 readers and because some of the records pertaining to the 1980 reader selection process could not be located, we were not able to establish how the general criteria were interpreted and what, if any, specific gender and racial/ethnic criteria were used in selecting field readers.

We reviewed the resumes and update sheets to determine if the 1982 readers met the education and experience selection criteria. All 75 readers met the education criteria--at least an undergraduate degree. We determined that 55 met the experience criteria--the other 20 did not provide enough information to permit a determination. For example, in some cases the reader did not indicate the level of experience--secondary or post-secondary. In other cases the level was shown, but the reader did not indicate the number of years of experience at that level. Consequently, we could not determine if the reader met one or two of the six experience criteria.

Conducting the grant reading session

The 1982 Talent Search reading was held from May 2 through 7, 1982. All readers were required to attend a 3- to 4-hour orientation on the evening of May 2. A brief welcoming introduction was followed by a group discussion of (1) panel makeup, (2) panel assignments, (3) paneling sessions, (4) roles of the panel chairperson, (5) conflicts of interest, (6) field reader performance evaluations, and (7) reimbursement policies and procedures.

Readers were told that to avoid any possible conflict of interest, they could not review an application from their own agency or institution. Readers were told to look over the applications they were scheduled to review during the week, noting the schools or agencies that applied, to decide whether they had a conflict. If they did not have a conflict, they signed and dated a Certification of Absence of Conflict of Interest Form. If there was a conflict of interest, the application(s) was assigned to another panel.

Later in the orientation session, readers were divided into smaller groups and instructed on the Talent Search regulations, the technical criteria on which applications would be evaluated, and the use of the Technical Review Forms to score proposals. Readers were also given some suggestions on how to evaluate applications. For example, it was suggested that they read the entire application completely before attempting to assign scores and mark up or highlight applications with their notes or comments. They were also cautioned that the best written application is not necessarily the best project and that attention should be paid to project design and content, rather than writing style.

Readers were also told that (1) they must complete two or sometimes three applications each day, (2) they were not to discuss applications among themselves until they met during the paneling session, and (3) they were not to discuss applications outside of their panels.

Paneling sessions

Each panel and its chairperson met daily in a "paneling session" to discuss the applications reviewed that day. Generally, the chairperson was responsible for conducting the grant application reading process, which included

--Reviewing panelists' Technical Review Forms (used in evaluating the grant applications) for consistency, completeness, adequacy of responses, and acceptability.

--Answering questions on the "legality or illegality" of the applications' narratives or proposals.

--Assuring that no one panel reader dominated or influenced other panel members.

Paneling sessions allowed readers the opportunity to discuss applications with each other, compare scores, and discuss the applications' strengths and weaknesses. During the paneling sessions readers could change their scores; however, no panelist was required to do so.

If, however, the difference between individual panel members' scores was 20 points or more, the chairperson attempted to resolve the point variation. The chairperson determined if the member whose score varied from those of the other two panelists understood the proposal and what his/her score was based on. If the reader changed his/her score, the chairperson requested that the comments also be changed to reflect the new score. Any reader who did not want to change his/her score was required to write a dissenting or minority opinion.

Scoring

During the balance of the week, readers read and scored applications. Each field reader was required to complete a Technical Review Form for each application read. On the form the reader documented his/her evaluation of the need for the project, the strengths and weaknesses of the applicant's plan to address the needs through the proposed project, and the applicant's plans for evaluating the project's success. The reader also identified ways in which the application did or did not meet the selection criteria. The reader also assigned points, within a given range, as to how well the application met each standard and criterion. The reader then computed a total score for the application from the points assigned under each criterion. A maximum score was 100 points.

Priority points

Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, authorizes the Secretary to consider "the prior experience of service delivery under the particular program for which funds are sought by each applicant."

To implement this provision, DSS officials determined which of the applicants for 1982 awards conducted Talent Search projects in fiscal years 1979, 1980, or 1981. DSS staff then evaluated the previous project and awarded up to 15 points, in addition to those awarded by the field readers, depending on the applicant's performance on a previous project. The criteria used to evaluate the prior project included

--the extent to which the project served the number of participants it was funded to serve;

--the extent to which the high school graduation rate of project participants was higher than the graduation rates in the target schools before the project began;

--the extent to which postsecondary placement of project participants is higher than the placement rates of the target schools before the project began;

--the extent to which the applicant had met all administrative requirements--including recordkeeping, reporting, and financial accountability--under the terms of the previously funded awards.

We reviewed DSS records and determined that 176 of the 177 applicants who had previously participated in a Talent Search project received priority points. Of the 176 applicants, 158 received between 11 and 15 priority points.

Program staff, in accordance with regulations, used the following sources of information for assessing prior performance and assigning priority points: grantees' performance reports, audit reports, site visit reports, previously funded applications, and the application under consideration.

Ranking and selecting applications for funding

The field readers' scores and the priority point scores were sent to a private contractor, who prepared a rank order listing based on a "composite," or final, score. The composite score was derived by adding the priority points to the mean of the three readers' scores.

Initially, DSS recommended funding for the top ranked 161 applications except for those ranked 128, 132, and 158. Funding was denied for these three because the projects (1) would not provide Talent Search-type services, (2) duplicated services in an area served by a higher ranking application, or (3) were too costly and went beyond the scope of Talent Search purposes.

The project ranked 167 was also recommended for funding because the State in which the project would be carried out did not have a Talent Search project; higher or equally ranked projects not funded were from States that already had a project.

Thus, DSS initially recommended 159 applicants for funding. The Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education approved the recommended projects on June 16, 1982.

Later, one of the approved applicants withdrew its application, which freed about $70,000; $641,594 was also transferred from one of the other TRIO programs. To use the additional money, the Assistant Secretary funded the applications ranked 163, 164, 165, 169, 170, 172, 175, 178, and 179. These applications were selected based on their ranking, the relative need for the project as indicated by the State's poverty population, how little the applicant's State was represented among previously selected projects, and/or the applicant's prior experience.

Determining final funding amounts

Final funding for a project was determined through a three-step process which included (1) the DSS staff's review of the proposed budget and development of a recommended budget, (2) the grants officer's review of the recommended budget, and (3) negotiations between the grants officer and the applicant.

DSS staff reviewed the applicants' proposed budgets and developed recommended budgets. In developing the recommended budgets, the program staff worked from the individual applications' 1981 budgets and funding levels (for previously funded applicants) and considered the following funding guidelines:

--Projects, particularly new urban projects, should not be funded to serve more than 1,000 participants; rural projects should be limited to 500 participants.

--Individual student cost per project should be between $71 and $120.

--Costs for new projects should not exceed $112,000.

--Administrative, counseling, tutorial, equipment, supply, communication, and travel costs should be within certain preestablished parameters.

--Increases in the costs of previously funded projects should be restricted to (1) no more than 10 percent above 1981 funding levels for applications whose mean field reader score was 90 or more, (2) no more than 5 percent over 1981 funding levels for applicants whose mean field reader score was 80 through 89, and (3) no increase for applications receiving a mean field reader score of less than 80.

DSS staff sent the recommended budgets to the grants officer, who reviewed the recommendations and negotiated the final funding amount with the applicants. Our review showed that, generally, the recommended budgets conformed to the funding guidelines and negotiated budgets did not differ significantly from recommended amounts.

In 1982, 167 Talent Search applications were funded, representing about two-thirds of the 268 applications reviewed. Of those funded, 32 received 100 percent or more of the amount requested, 24 received from 91 to 99 percent, 56 received between 75 and 90 percent, 49 received from 50 to 74 percent, and 6 received less than 50 percent. Of the 167 awards, 157 were to institutions which operated Talent Search projects in one of the previous three fiscal years, and 10 were to new awardees.

Of the 140 grantees who had conducted Talent Search projects in 1981, 115 received at least 100 percent of their 1981 grant amount.

LEGISLATION, DEPARTMENT REGULATIONS, AND PROGRAM DIRECTIVES

In addition to the authorizing statutes, the discretionary grant process operates under the following Department and program regulations, manuals, plans, and directives.

GENERAL GRANT REGULATIONS (34 C.F.R. PART 74)

These regulations establish uniform requirements for the administration of grants and principles for determining costs applicable to activities assisted by grants.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS (34 C.F.R. PART 75)

These regulations apply to each of the three programs under review and provide general rules on how to apply for grants, how grants are made, general conditions that apply to grantees, grantees' administrative responsibilities, and ED's compliance procedures.

Under "how grants are made," the regulations (1) establish the general criteria on which applications will be evaluated, (2) authorize the use of groups of experts (field readers) to evaluate grant applications, (3) require a rank ordering of applications based on the readers' evaluations, and (4) establish the items that may be considered when selecting applications for funding, including the rank order listing and any other priorities or program requirements published in the Federal Register.

PROGRAM REGULATIONS

In addition to the General Grant and General Administrative Regulations, WEEAP, Talent Search, and the Unsolicited Proposal Program are each governed by individual program regulations. These regulations basically incorporate and expand on the provisions of the authorizing legislation and the Department regulations.

WEEAP regulations (34 C.F.R. part 745)

The WEEAP regulations (1) establish WEEAP funding priorities, (2) establish the specific criteria on which applications are evaluated, (3) establish additional criteria, in addition to the rank order listing, on which applications are selected for funding, and (4) set out certain allowable and nonallowable project costs.

Talent Search Program regulations (34 C.F.R. part 643)

The regulations (1) define eligible grant applications and eligible project participants, (2) establish specific criteria on which applications are evaluated, and (3) identify certain allowable and nonallowable costs not specifically covered by the General Grant Regulations.

Unsolicited Proposal Program regulations (34 C.F.R. part 700ff)

These regulations establish NIE's Unsolicited Proposal Program and establish specific criteria, in addition to that specified in the General Administrative Regulations, on which unsolicited proposals will be evaluated.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES GRANTS ADMINISTRATION MANUAL

The manual establishes policies and procedures for the award, review, and management of grants. Topics covered in the manual include

--using independent review groups (field readers),

--preventing conflicts of interest,

--conducting review sessions,

--ranking applications,

--approving and selecting applications for funding, and

--determining final funding amounts.

ED GRANT AND PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT MANUAL, CHAPTER III, SECTION 2

Chapter III, section 2, of the Grant and Procurement Management Manual, entitled Discretionary Grant Program Review and Administrative Procedures, has not been officially adopted by ED. However, according to an ED memorandum, it is to be considered in effect for all programs for which guidance is needed on proper procedures regarding the award of discretionary grants. Briefly, chapter III, section 2, establishes departmental policy and procedures for the review, selection, and approval of grant applications.

TECHNICAL REVIEW PLANS

A technical review plan is prepared annually for WEEAP and the Talent Search Program outlining the specific procedures to be followed during the annual grant competitions. Included in the plans are the

--methods of selecting field readers and the field reader selection criteria;

--procedures for forming panels and assigning applications to panels,

--duration and content of field reader orientation sessions,

--criteria on which applications are evaluated, and

--manner in which award decisions are made.

NIE OPERATING GUIDELINES

NIE operating guides establish procedures for processing unsolicited proposals. Generally, these guides describe the steps in the processing of unsolicited proposals and identify the NIE office or official responsible for performing each step.

FIELD READER OUTREACH PROGRAM

The Department of Education established the Field Reader Outreach Program in March 1982 to assist program offices in recruiting field readers. The Outreach Program's objectives were to

--broaden and update the pool of qualified readers,

--improve the procedures for selecting field readers, and

--increase State and local participation in the recruitment of field readers.

According to ED officials instrumental in establishing the Outreach Program, it was not designed to replace the existing system in which program offices developed their own pools of field readers, but rather to supplement the existing pools with additional names.

According to these officials there was concern in ED that the same field readers were being used year after year, that these readers exhibited a "liberal" bias, and that they had become a part of the programs' "networks," thus minimizing the independence of the field reader evaluation process. They said ED attempted, through the Outreach Program, to solicit new readers with "conservative" philosophies and to give more responsibility to Assistant Secretaries and other senior officials in selecting field readers.

To develop a pool of field readers, the Director of the Outreach Program surveyed program offices to assess their needs for field readers in 1982. Twenty of 143 discretionary grant programs indicated a need for field readers--the other programs either had completed their grant competitions or had selected, or were in the process of selecting, field readers for 1982. The Outreach Program obtained the field reader selection criteria from each of the 20 programs. New readers were recruited through the Assistant Secretaries, other senior officials, and the Secretary's 10 regional representatives. These officials were given the field reader selection criteria for each program needing field readers along with instructions that readers should include handicapped individuals and reflect diversity in sex, race, and geographical location. Instructions were not provided on how to solicit potential readers.

Also in March 1982, according to ED's then Executive Secretary, he, the Comptroller, and the Director of the Outreach Program met with representatives of several "conservative" research organizations and briefed them on the Outreach Program and the need for new readers. Individuals attending the briefing were given the field reader selection criteria and were requested to solicit resumes of prospective readers and submit them to ED.

In response to these efforts, the Outreach Program received about 700 resumes, most of which were submitted by the regional offices. According to the Outreach Director, she and other Department employees reviewed the resumes, grouped them according to the various programs' selection criteria, then forwarded them to the appropriate Assistant Secretaries.

Fourteen of the 20 program offices that received resumes from the Outreach Program used one or more of these referrals. Of about 800 field readers used by the 20 programs, about 100 (or 12.5 percent) were Outreach Program recruits.

According to program officials responsible for selecting field readers, most of the individuals whose resumes were provided by the Outreach Program were not qualified to read grant applications in those programs. Other candidates not selected to read were either invited but unavailable to read or disqualified because of a possible conflict of interest. Also in some instances, programs received resumes from the Outreach Program after field reader selections had been made and, thus, were unable to use these referrals.

There was no Department policy regarding the use of individuals solicited through the Outreach Program. The decision to use or not use the referrals was left to the discretion of the Assistant Secretary who had responsibility for the grant program. WEEAP and one other program were required by the Acting Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education to use the Outreach Program as the sole source for field readers. Ten other programs were required to give preference to qualified readers referred by the Outreach Program, and eight programs had no policy regarding the use of Outreach Program referrals.

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, EMPLOYMENT, AND ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF 1981 WEEAP FIELD READERS

ABBREVIATIONS

Race/ethnicity

AA - Asian American
B - Black
H - Hispanic
NA - Native American
W - White

Degree

AA - Associate in Arts
AAS - Associate in Applied Science
AB - Bachelor of Arts
BA - Bachelor of Arts
B.Ed. - Bachelor of Education
BM - Bachelor of Music
BS - Bachelor of Science
BSE - Bachelor of Science in Education
BSEE - Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education
CAS - Certificate of Advanced Study
DDS - Doctor of Dental Surgery
Ed.D - Doctor of Education
Ed.S - Education Specialist
JD - Juris Doctor
MA - Master of Arts
M.Ed - Master of Education
MH - Master of Humanities
MS - Master of Science
MSW - Master of Social Work
NI - Not indicated
Ph.D - Doctor of Philosophy

Other/miscellaneous

CC - Community College
CETA - Comprehensive Employment and Training Act
Coll. - College
DHEW - Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
DHHS - Department of Health and Human Services
DHUD - Department of Housing and Urban Development
dis - Disabled

Ed.- Education
EEO - Equal Employment Opportunity
ERIC - Educational Resource Information Center
ESAA - Emergency School Aid Act
ESEA - Elementary and Secondary Education Act
Jr. Coll. - Junior College
NEA - National Education Association
S.E. - Southeast
TRIO - Special Programs for the Disadvantaged
U. - University
WEEA - Women's Educational Equity Act
YMCA - Young Men's Christian Association
YWCA - Young Women's Christian Association

MODEL PROJECTS ON TITLE IX COMPLIANCE

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer * affiliations (if listed) **
1. BA	Sociology	Temple U.	AA	News Editor, Organization of Chinese American Women Program Analyst, Office of Special Concerns; Asian American Affairs - DHHS Program Analyst, Office of Special Concerns; Steering Committee on Women's Issues - DHEW Information Specialist, Project on the Status and Ed. of Women Research Assistant, Dept. of Public Safety
2. Ph.D	Ed. Leadership	U.S. International U.	B	Assistant Chief, Intergroup Relations, California State Dept. of Ed.
MA	Ed.	U. of California, Berkeley		
BA	Ed.	San Francisco State		
3. NI	General Ed.	U. of Arizona	W	Executive Director, Tucson Women's Commission Coordinator of Grants, Pima Community Coll. NAACP New Directions for Young Women Pima County CETA Board Executive Women's Council Judicial Nominating Committee
	General Ed.	George Washington U.		
	Business	Strayer Coll.		
4. Ed.D	Curriculum	North Illinois U.	B	Vice President, private consulting firm Project Director, Title IX Sex Desegregation Supervisor, Title IV-C Ed. Innovations Dept. Chairman, Special Ed., Metropolitan State Coll.
MS	Elementary Ed.	Indiana U.		
BS	Biology/ Chemistry	Hampton Institute		
5. Ph.D	Physical Ed.	U. of Iowa	W	Chairman of Graduate Program, U. of Iowa Title IX Consultant, Midwest Area Acting Executive Director, Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women
MA	" "	U. of North Carolina		
BS	Physical Ed./ English	Middle Tennessee State U.		
6. Ph.D	Indian Ed. Policy	Pennsylvania State U.	NA	Instructor, Pennsylvania State U. Director, Project Media, National Indian Ed. Association
M.Ed	Ed. Administration	" " "		
BA	Elementary Ed.	Arizona State U.		Educational Resources Information Center (Clearinghouse)
7. JD	Law	New York U. School of Law	W	Director, Office on Domestic Violence - DHHS Special Assistant to General Counsel - DHEW Legislative Assistant, U.S. House of Representatives Staff Counsel, New York State Moreland Commission on Nursing Homes D.C. Commission for Women Committee on Sexual Assault and Intra-family Offenses Women's Legal Defense Fund My Sister's Place
BA	Political Science	U. of Rochester		

---

* Employment history covers January 1, 1975, through January 1981.

** Affiliations cover January 1, 1980, through January 1981.

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
8. Ph.D	Political Science	U. of Chicago	B	Assistant Professor of Government, Dartmouth Coll. Visiting Assistant Professor of Political Science, Howard U. Lecturer in Government, Dartmouth Coll.
MA	Political Science	" " "		
BA	Political Science	Albertus Magnus Coll.		
9. MS	Physical Ed.	U. of Washington	H	Physical Ed. Instructor, Bellevue Community Coll. Physical Ed. Workshop Director for Displaced Homemakers, Bellevue Community Coll.
BA	Biology & Physical Ed.	New Mexico Highlands U.		
10. BS	Ed.	Texas Tech U.	W	Coordinator of Special Projects, KLRN-TV Director of Personnel, Affirmative Action Officer - State Bar of Texas Community Services Coordinator, State Bar of Texas (Various Consultant Positions) American Society for Training & Development International Industrial Television Association
11. Ph.D	Counseling & Guidance	Atlanta U.	B	Associate Professor of Counseling, North Carolina Central U. Assistant Professor of Counseling, Auburn U. Counselor, CETA Program, Dekalb County Board of Ed.
MA	Counseling & Guidance	" "		
AB	Speech, Drama, English	West Virginia State Coll.		
12. BA	Political Science	U. of California, Berkeley	AA	Ed. Program Officer - Dissemination, U.S. Dept. of Ed. Ed. Program Officer - TRIO, U.S. Office of Ed. Contracts & Grants Officer, U.S. Office of Ed. National Organization of Scholars of Asian Descent Association for Asian Studies California Association for Asian Bilingual Ed. National Association for Asian-American & Pacific Ed. Oakland Asian American Library Advisory Committee Chinese for Affirmative Action Pacific & Asian American Women Bay Area Coalition Asian & Pacific American Concerns Committee Asian & Pacific Americans Federal Employee Counsel Organization of Chinese Americans
13. MA	Administration	San Francisco State U.	AA	Staff Assistant, Office of Special Funded Projects - CETA Planning Officer, San Francisco Unified School District Ed. Specialist, U.S. Office of Ed., ESEA Title I Council of Chief State School Officers, Committee on Evaluation & Information Systems Board of Directors, Children's Garden
BA	Mathematics	Brown U.		

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
14. Ed.D	Administration	Harvard Graduate School of Ed.	H	Instructor, Bilingual Ed., Harvard Graduate School of Ed. Spanish Materials Assessor, Lesley Coll. Project Director - Emergency School Aid Act, Bridgeport Board of Ed.
MS	Bilingual Urban Ed.	Long Island U.		
BA	English	Brooklyn Coll.		
15. Ph.D	Ed.	U. of Michigan	W	Ed. Consultant, Self-Employed American Association of U. Women Equity Policy Center National Association for Women Deans, Administrators & Counselors National Endowment for the Humanities JWK International Corp. American Institute for Research Intercollegiate Association for Women Students
M.Ed	Ed.	Wayne State U.		
BA	Liberal Arts	" " "		

MODEL PROJECTS ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY FOR RACIAL AND ETHNIC MINORITY WOMEN

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
16. MSW	Administration	Fordham U.	H	Consultant - Titles IV, VII, IX, U.S. Office of Ed. Consultant, Midwest Race & Sex Desegregation Assistance Center Consultant, Aspira of Illinois, Inc. Project Director, Aspira of New York, Inc. Senior Researcher, Aspira of New York, Inc. The Hispanic American Career Ed. Resources Inc. National Association of Social Workers
BS	Ed.	St. John's U.		
17. MA	Counseling	San Diego State Coll.	AA	Deputy Director of Special Projects, City & County of San Francisco Voting Rights Consultant, Office of the Secretary of State, California Personnel Consultant, California Construction Corp. Dept. Chairman, Asian American Studies, U. of California
AB	Economics	San Francisco State Coll.		
18. BA	Native American Ed.	The Evergreen State Coll.	NA	School Counselor/Pre-School Coordinator/Teacher, Wa-He-Lute Indian School Faculty Member, The Evergreen State Coll. Program coordinator, Olympia School YWCA Racial Justice Committee American Indian Women's Gathering
19. Ph.D	Speech	Louisiana State U.	NA	Scripts Writer-Radio, Oklahoma Image Project Film Narrator, Forest Heritage Center Film Producer/Director, Northeastern State
MA	"	U. of Michigan		
BA	Speech/English	Oklahoma Coll. for Women		
20. Ph.D	Human Resources Development	Union Graduate School	B	Program Coordinator/Org. Specialist, Women's Leadership Development - NEA Program Coordinator - Minority Leadership Training, NEA
BA	Business Administration	Bluefield State Coll.		

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethni-city	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
21. MSW	Social Work Public Policy	U. of California, Berkeley	H	Administrative Fellow, San Jose State U. Student Affairs Officer, California Polytechnic State U. National Association of Women Deans & Administrators Mexican American National Women's Association President's Task Force on Outreach/Retention
MA	Counseling Psychology	Not indicated		
BA	Social Research	U. of California, Santa Barbara		
22. Ed.D	Ed. Psychology	U. of Tennessee	B	Regional Director Organization Assistance Center, U. of Tennessee
MA	School & Counseling Psychology	Austin Peay State U.		
BS	Psychology/ Sociology/ Philosophy	" " " "		
23. MA	Speech-Communications	Oklahoma State U.	NA	Co-Director, Indian Teacher Training, Northeastern State U. Director, Indian Ed., Tulsa Public Schools National Indian Ed. Association Help-in-Crisis Task Force United Council of Oklahoma Indian Educators Cherokee Tribe Ed. Committee American Indian Theatre Company
BS	Ed.	" " "		
24. MA	Home Economics & Nutrition	New York U.	AA	Consumer Ed. Teacher, New York City Board of Ed.'s Adult Consumer & Homemaking Ed. Program Teacher - English as a Second Language, New York City Board of Ed.'s Adult Basic Ed. Program First National Asian/Pacific Women's Conference Women's Action Alliance
BA	Home Economics & Consumer Studies	Brooklyn Coll. of CUNY		
25. Ph.D	History	U. of Colorado	B	Instructor, U. of Louisville, U. of Colorado, U. of Mississippi Chairman, Pan African Studies Dept., U. of Louisville Consultant on Black Studies, National Council on Black Studies and Ed. Testing Center
MA	"	" " "		
BA	"	" " "		
26. Ph.D	Political Science	U. of California	H	Associate Dean, Labor Coll., State U. of New York Program Officer, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Ed. - DHEW Academic Advisor & Executive Assistant to Provost, Antioch Coll. West, Antioch U. Director, Immigration, National Lawyer's Guild Senior Development Officer, U.S. Human Resources Corp. Associate Instructor, U. of California, Riverside Community Coll.
MA	Political Science	Yale U.		
BA	Political Science & Latin American Studies	U. of California		
27. MSW	Generic Social Work	Howard U.	B	Coordinator, Mayor's Office of Human Development Coordinator, Management by Objective, Baltimore City Dept. of Ed.
BS	Sociology/ Psychology	Loyola Coll.		

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
28. NI			NA	Indian Ed. Consultant, Salish Kootenai Community Coll.
29. MA BA	Social Service Administration Psychology	U. of Chicago U. of Puerto Rico	H	Consultant, Self-Employed Executive Director, Latino Institute, Chicago
30. MA BA AA	History History Anthropology/ Economics Liberal Arts	Duke U. Vassar Coll. CUNY-Staten Island Coll.	B	Instructor of Black Studies, Wellesley Coll. (Various Teaching & Consulting Positions) North Carolina Land Trustees of America American Historical Association
31. Ph.D MA BA	Ed. English "	U. of California, Berkeley Columbia U. U. of Pennsylvania	AA	Assistant Professor of Asian American Studies, U. of California Instructor of English as a Second Language, Laney Coll. Acting Assistant Professor of Asian American Studies, U. of California Producer, Community Affairs - KTVU National Association of Bilingual Ed. Asian Manpower Services Korean Community Center of the East Bay National Association for Asian & Pacific American Ed. Korean Christian Scholars Assoc. National Korean-American Bilingual Ed. Association Association for Asian-Pacific American Studies San Francisco Korean Forum Northern California Koreans for Democracy Asian Media Alliance Asian Women United
32. BA	Fine Arts	Art Institute of Chicago	H	Minister, Spanish Christian Church Producer-Host, WLS-TV
33. Ph.D (cand) MA BS	Ethno-History Science Ed. Secondary Ed.	Emory U. " " West. Carolina U.	NA	Science Dept. Chairman, Lovett School Science Teacher, Lovett School Instructor - Adult Ed., Clayton Jr. Coll. Instructor, Emory U. American Indian Center of Atlanta National Indian Ed. Association National Science Teachers Association American Business Women's Association North American Indian Women's Association Georgia Association of Independent Schools Georgia State Commission Indian Affairs
34. MSW BS	Social Work Sociology	Howard U. Morgan State U.	B	Consultant, National Institute of Health Program Analyst, Division of Planning & Evaluation - DHHS Director of Special Projects, National Center on Black Aged

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethni-city	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
35. MS	Ed.	Central Connecticut State Coll.	H	Program Officer, U.S. Dept. of Ed. Youth Employment Program Ed. Policy Fellow, George Washington U. Coordinator, Upward Bound-CETA Demonstration Project, U.S. Dept. of Ed. Newspaper Advisor, Hartford Public Schools Teacher - Language, Reading, Career Development, South Windsor & Hartford Public Schools Coordinator, Social Literacy Institute, U. of Massachusetts American Association of Teachers of Spanish & Portuguese Connecticut Council of Language Teachers Cuban-American Legal Defense & Ed. Fund, Inc. League of Cuban-American Community-Based Centers, Inc. NEA, Chicano Hispano Caucus NEA, Women's Caucus Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Language
BS	"	" " "		
36. Ed.D	Bilingual/ Multicultural Ed.	U. of San Francisco	AA	Consultant, Self-Employed
MA	Ed. Administration	San Francisco State U.		
BA	English	U. of California, Berkeley		
37. BA	Political Science	San Francisco State U.	AA	Assistant Director, Center for S.E. Asian Refugee Resettlement Community Liaison Coordinator/Employment Counselor, Center for S.E. Asian Refugee Resettlement Manager, Holiday Inn Restaurant Financial Affairs Agent, Real Estate Firm Administrative Assistant, European Book Company
38. AAS	Business	Alfred State Coll.	NA	Editor, Press Secretary, Seneca Nation of Indians' Newspaper Public Relations, Seneca Nation of Indians' Newspaper Owner/Operator of Tribal Business
39. Ph.D (cand)	American History	U. of Pittsburgh	B	Assistant Professor, Remedial Coll. Reading, World Civilization & Women in World History, Alabama A&M U. Public Speaker, Conf. Organizer, Lecturer—Women's History - Carlow Coll., U. of Pittsburgh, Historical Associations Teaching Fellow in American History & Women's History, U. of Pittsburgh Book Reviewer on Women's History Southern Conference on Afro-American Studies President's National Advisory Council on Women's Ed. Programs
AA	Secondary Ed. & American History	U. of Alabama		
MA	Ed. Research & American History	" " "		
BS	Secondary Ed. & American History	" " "		
40. Ed.D	Curriculum & Instruction	U. of California, Berkeley	H	Associate Professor, Dept. of Ed., Texas A&M U. Assistant Professor, Dept. of Ed., Texas A&M U. National Council for the Social Studies Society for Historical Ed. The Elementary Ed. Section of Social Ed.
MA	Curriculum & Instruction	" " " "		
BA	History	" " " "		

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
41. Ph.D MA BA	Political Science Asian Studies Economics	U. of California, Berkeley U. of Hawaii Swarthmore Coll.	AA	Assistant Professor of Asian American Studies, U. of California Asian American Studies National Endowment for the Humanities Berkeley Academic Senate Council for Ethnic Studies Curricula
42. MA BA	Social & Cultural Anthropology Social & Cultural Anthropology	Duke U. U. of California	B	Technical Support Specialist, Clearing House for Community-Based Ed. Institutions Research Consultant, Fair Housing Project-DHUD, A.L. Nellum & Associates Research Assistant, Institute for the Study of Ed. Policy, Howard U.
43. CAS M.Ed BA	Ed. Administration Ed. Administration Political Science	Harvard Grad. School of Ed. Harvard Grad. School of Ed. State U. of New York	NA	Associate Director of Information & Publications, Development Associates Ed. Program Specialist, Office of Indian Ed., U.S. Office of Ed. Director of Adult Ed. Program, Boston Indian Council
44. MA MA BA	Linguistics Supervision & Administration History	Columbia U., Teachers Coll. Pace U. City Coll. of New York	AA	Associate Ed. Program Specialist, New York State Ed. Dept. Coordinator of Evening English Programs, LaGuardia Community College Coordinator of Funded Programs, Lower East Side High School Chinese Service Center of New York National Association of Teaching English as a Second Language New York State Association of Bilingual Educators New York State Association of Teaching English as a Second Language Community Planning Board Municipal Financial Committee Chinatown Planning Council Washington Irving Community Association
45. MA BA	Ed./Cultural Studies Ed./Spanish	Indiana U. " "	NA	Chief Curriculum Developer, U. of Colorado Manager, Apartment Building Dissemination & Workshop Specialist, Social Science Ed. Consortium Teacher/Community Training Consultant, Race & Sex Desegregation Assistance Centers Assistant Director/Recruitment & Follow Through Specialist, Washington State U. Ed. Equity Specialist, New Mexico State Dept. of Ed. Association for Humanistic Psychology Association for Transpersonal Psychology National Association for Bilingual Ed. Colorado Association of Bilingual Ed. National Council for the Social Studies
46. Ph.D MA BA	Ed./Psychology Psychology "	U. of Maryland U. of Puerto Rico " " " "	H	Executive Staff, Program Development & Evaluation, Montgomery County Government Director, Foreign Student Admissions Office, Montgomery County Public Schools Lecturer, Psychology Dept., Montgomery Coll. School Psychologist, Montgomery County Public Schools Lecturer, Various Universities & Community Colleges Consultant & Statewide Services Grant Reviewer - DHEW

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
47. M.Ed.	Ed. Administration	Pennsylvania State U.	NA	Program Developer, Baker U. & Haskell Indian Jr. Coll.
BS	Elementary Ed.	U. of North Dakota		Consultant, American Indian Higher Ed. Consortium
48. Ed.D	Ed. Administration	Western Colorado U.	W	Ombudsman, Tucson Public Schools Director, Career Ed., Tucson Public Schools
M.Ed.	Ed. Administration	U. of Arizona		
BA	Elementary Ed.	" " "		
MODEL PROJECTS ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY FOR DISABLED WOMEN				
49. AA	General	Community Coll. of Philadelphia	W dis	Program Specialist, Regional Technical Assistance Staff - DHHS Program Coordinator, Public Interest Law Center of Philadelphia Equal Opportunity Specialist, Office for Civil Rights - DHEW Staff Assistant, Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs - DHEW Nationwide Affirmative Action Task Force American Friends Service Committee
50. MA	Sociology	U. of California, Berkeley	B dis	Training/Outreach Coordinator, Center for Independent Living, Disability Law Resource Center Project Coordinator, Antioch Coll. Oakland New Careers Development Corp. Volunteer Bureau of Alameda West Oakland Legal Switchboard YWCA Berkeley Project Advisory Committee Consumer Cooperatives of Berkeley Magnolia Street Three Defense Fund Committee
AB	Public Speaking	San Francisco State		
51. Bachelor in Architecture	Architecture	U. of Michigan	W dis	Self-Employed High Spirit Multiple Sclerosis White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals West Virginia Advisory Council on the Ed. of Exceptional Children
OTHER AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES				
52. Ph.D	Psychology	California Western U.	AA	Principal Investigator, U. of California San Francisco Far-West Lab. Consultant/Technical Assistance, National Office of Samoan Affairs, Inc., U. of California San Francisco Far-West Lab. Coll. Counselor, San Francisco Community Coll. District & Skills Center Principal Training Officer/Assistant Secretary of State, Prime Minister's Office - Government of Tonga Asian/Pacific National Women's Network, San Mateo Community Coalition National Island Women's Association Asian American Community Council
MS	"	" " "		

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
53. MA	English/French Literature	New York U.	W	Instructor, New York Feminist Art Institute Assistant to the Chairman, Art Dept., Hunter Coll. of New York Instructor of Language Arts, Coll. of New Rochelle Free Lance Writer & Consultant, Art Organizations & Ed. Programs
BS	American Literature	City Coll. of New York		
54. M.Ed.	Ed.	Antioch Coll.	H	Executive Director, Texas Job Bank
BA	Sociology	U. of Texas		
55. Ph.D	Counselor/Ed.	New York U.	AA	Director of Financial Aid, York Coll. of CUNY
MA	Guidance/ Counseling	U. of San Francisco		
BA	Psychology	U. of the Philippines		
56. Ed.D	Motor Learning	Columbia U., Teachers Coll.	W	Associate Professor, Director of Research Lab., U. of Georgia Associate Professor, Director of Graduate Studies, U. of Georgia Associate Professor, Cleveland State U. Assistant Professor of Physical Ed. and Women's Studies, Queens Coll., City U. of New York
MA	Movement Sciences	" " " "		
AB	Political Science	Manhattanville Coll.		
57. Ed.D	Teacher Ed.	George Washington U.	B	Director of Overseas Ed. Assistance, NEA Seminar Director - Women's Leadership Training Programs, World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession
MA	Student Personnel Administration African Studies	Columbia U. Teachers Coll.		
BA	English/Ed.	Virginia Union U.		
58. Ph.D	Political Science	U. of Chicago	B	Chairman & Professor, Political Science Dept., Howard U. Assistant Professor, Princeton U. Guest Scholar, Brookings Institution
MA	Political Science	" " "		
BA	Political Science	Antioch Coll.		
59. MA	Early Childhood Ed.	Sacramento California State U.	AA	Site Administrator, Washington Children's Center, Sacramento City Unified School District Site Supervisor, Sierra Children's Center, Sacramento City Unified School District
BSE	Early Childhood Ed./Social Science	California State U.		
BSEE	Elementary Ed.	Philadelphia Normal Coll.		
AA	Elementary Certificate	" " "		
60. MA	Pacific Island Studies	U. of Hawaii	W	Research Specialist, Public Service Satellite Consortium Special Assistant to the Regional Director - Peace Corps Pacific Area Specialist, Pacific & Asian Affairs Council & Outreach Coordinator, U. of Hawaii Project Coordinator, East-West Learning Institute
AB	English	Bates Coll.		
61. MA	Ed. Psychology	Michigan State U.	H	Research Associate, American Institutes for Research
BA	Psychology & Sociology	Texas A&I U.		Teacher - Migrant Program, Elementary Ed., Bilingual Program, School Districts in Kansas & Michigan Lansing Schools Ed. Association Michigan Ed. Association NEA

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
62. Ph.D	Administration	Walden U.	B	Consultant, California State Dept. of Ed.
MH	Home Economics	U. of Oklahoma		
BS	" "	Langston U.		American Home Economics Association
MS (equivalent)	Ed. Administration	San Francisco State Coll.		American Association of U. Women
				NAACP
				California Personnel & Guidance Association
				Marin County Political Women's Caucus
				The Female Executive
63. Ph.D (cand)	Vocational Ed.	Union West Graduate School	NA	Director - Multicultural Student Services, Highline Community Coll.
BA	Business Administration	Michigan State Coll.		Puget Sound Regional Community Coll. Association
BA	NI	The Evergreen State Coll.		
NI	Business Administration	Lansing U. of Business		American Indian Women's Service League
				Northwest Indian Women Circle
				Northwest American Women's Association
				National Indian Ed. Association
64. BA	Fine Arts	Howard U.	B	Self-Employed Ed. Consultant
				Associate Director, Women's Equity Action League
				Project Coordinator, Education & Legal Defense Fund
				Executive Associate, Project on the Status & Ed. of Women, Association of American Coll.
65. Ph.D	Ed. Administration Supervision	U. of Illinois	W	Associate Professor of Ed., U. of Iowa
MA	History Curriculum	" " "		
BS	General Science	U. of Alabama		
66. NI			NA	Public Information Specialist, Indian Information Program
67. Ph.D (cand)	Bilingual Ed. Administration & Supervision	U. of Illinois	H	Director, Bilingual Multicultural Ed., Illinois State U.
				Assistant to the Director/Materials Specialist, Bilingual Ed., Western Illinois U.
MS	Ed. Administration & Supervision Languages	Southern Illinois U.		
BS	Political Science	" " "		
68. Ph.D (cand)	Bicultural/ Bilingual Ed.	U. of New Mexico	NA	Free Lance Consultant for Various Organizations
MA	Anthropology Ed.	U. of Arizona		Field Project Director, Colorado State U.
BA	Sociology	Mt. Mercy Coll.		

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
69. Ph.D	Linguistics	Ateneo de Manilla U. Philippine Normal Coll.	AA	Associate Professor, Multicultural Ed. Program, U. of San Francisco Credential Coordinator, Multicultural Ed. Program, U. of San Francisco Assistant Professor, Multicultural Ed. Program, U. of San Francisco Instructor, U. of the Philippines Assistant Professor, U. of the Philippines California Association for Asian Bilingual Ed. National Association for Asian Pacific American Ed. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Linguistic Society of the Philippines East-West Center Alumni Association
MA	NI	U. of Hawaii		
BS	Elementary Ed.	Philippine Normal		
70. M.Ed.	Curriculum Supervision	Texas A&M	AA	Financial Planner, Comfi Services Project Coordinator, Organization of Pan Asian Women Registered Representative, Investors Diversified Services Project Coordinator, Waco Independent School District
BS	Art & Merchandising	UCLA		
Certificate	Deaf Ed.	U. of Texas		
71. MS	Speech Pathology	Boston U.	W dis	Director, Client Services, Boston Self-Help Center Instructor of Re-Evaluation Counseling for Disabled Members of a Community Personal Growth & Support Network Rehabilitation Clinician, New England Sinai Hospital
BA	Linguistics Psychology	U. of California		
72. Ph.D	Instructional Technology	Syracuse U.	B	Chairperson, Special Ed., Virginia Union U. Director, Student Services, Kendall School, Gallaudet Coll.
MS	Ed.	Gallaudet Coll.		
BS	Biology	Hampton Institute		

MODEL PROJECTS TO INFLUENCE LEADERS IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
73. NI			B	Self-Employed Consultant
74. D.Ed.	Higher Ed. Administration	Pennsylvania State U.	H	Program Director, Minority Ed., Western Interstate Commission for Higher Ed. Research Associate & Vice President for Planning & Development, National Institute for Multicultural Ed. Director of Coll. Relations & Assistant to the President, Coll. of the Virgin Islands Self-Employed Consultant/Contractor, Higher Ed. State Coll. Research Assistant & Assistant to the Acting Dean of the Coll. of Ed., Pennsylvania State U. American Association of Higher Ed. Association for the Study of Higher Ed. Association for Institutional Research American Ed. Research Association
M.Ed.	Cultural Foundations in Ed.	U. of Utah		
BA	Political Science	" " "		

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
75. Ph.D	Political Theory Public Administration	U. of Wisconsin	W	Professor, Political Science, U. of Wisconsin Executive Director, National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year Deputy Conference Coordinator, National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year National Association of Commissions for Women Alverno College, President's Advisory Council
MA	Political Science	" " "		
BA	Political Science	" " "		
76. Ph.D	Ed. Administration & Supervision	Claremont Graduate School	H	Associate Professor, California State U. Assistant Professor, California State U. National Ed. Association Congress of Faculty Associations Higher Ed. Council Higher Ed. Caucus Women's Caucus Chicano Caucus California Colleges and U. Faculty Association Minority Affairs Advisory Committee
MA	Ed. Administration & Supervision	Claremont Graduate School		
BA	History	Immaculate Heart Coll.		
77. Ph.D	Speech Communication	Northwestern U.	AA	Full Professor, American University Associate Professor, American University Speech Communication Association Eastern Communication Association International Communication Association Communication Association of the Pacific Metropolitan Washington Communication Association American Association of U. Professors Society for Intercultural Ed., Training, & Research
MA	Speech Communication	Columbia U.		
BA	English/Drama	Goucher Coll.		
78. MA	English Literature	New York U.	B	Retired Teacher
Certificate	Shakespeare	Shakespeare Institute		
NI	English	New York U.		
79. Ph.D	Ed.	U. of St. Louis	B	Superintendent of Schools, Wellston Schools Assistant Director of Admissions/Counseling Psychologist/Professor of Ed., Washington U.
MA	Ed./Counseling	" " "		
BA	Elementary Ed.	Harris Teachers Coll.		
NI	Counseling Psychology & Practicum	Southern Illinois U. U. of Illinois U. of Missouri		
80. Ph.D	Russian History	U. of Iowa	W	President, Metropolitan State Coll. Vice President, Academic Affairs, U of San Fran.
MA	English History	" "		
AB	History	U. of Detroit		
81. MA	Ed. Administration	U. of Wisconsin	NA	Assistant Supervisor, Indian Ed., Wisconsin Dept. of Public Instruction American Indian Specialist, New Mexico State U. Resource Room Teacher, Albuquerque Indian School
BA	Secondary Ed.	U. of New Mexico		
82. NI			H	Director, EEO, DHUD

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
83. Ph.D (cand)	Curriculum	Indiana U.	W	Associate Instructor, Indiana U. Program Specialist, Sex Desegregation, Assistance Center of the Southwest
M.Ed.	Ed.	Stephen F. Austin		
BA	English	Keuka Coll.		
84. NI	Sociology	U. of Maryland	W dis	Commissioner, Employment Development Commission, Montgomery County Government Chairperson, Training & Development Committee, Montgomery County Government Lecturer, Handicapped Citizens: Human Services & Human Relations Lecturer, Handicapped Citizens in the Family & Community, U. of Maryland Lecturer, Montgomery Coll. Handicapped Representative, Long Branch Library, Montgomery County

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, EMPLOYMENT, AND ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF 1982 WEEAP FIELD READERS

ABBREVIATIONS

Race/ethnicity

AA - Asian American
B - Black
H - Hispanic
NA - Native American
W - White

Degree

AA - Associate in Arts
AAS - Associate in Applied Science
AB - Bachelor of Arts
BA - Bachelor of Arts
B.Ed. - Bachelor of Education
BM - Bachelor of Music
BS - Bachelor of Science
BSE - Bachelor of Science in Education
BSEE - Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education
CAS - Certificate of Advanced Study
DDS - Doctor of Dental Surgery
Ed.D - Doctor of Education
Ed.S - Education Specialist
JD - Juris Doctor
MA - Master of Arts
M.Ed. - Master of Education
MH - Master of Humanities
MS - Master of Science
MSW - Master of Social Work
NI - Not indicated
Ph.D. - Doctor of Philosophy

Other/miscellaneous

CC - Community College
CETA - Comprehensive Employment and Training Act
Coll. - College
DHEW - Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
DHHS - Department of Health and Human Services
DHUD - Department of Housing and Urban Development
dis - Disabled

Ed.- Education
EEO - Equal Employment Opportunity
ERIC - Educational Resource Information Center
ESAA - Emergency School Aid Act
ESEA - Elementary and Secondary Education Act
Jr. Coll. - Junior College
NEA - National Education Association
S.E. - Southeast
TRIO - Special Programs for the Disadvantaged
U. - University
WEEA - Women's Educational Equity Act
YMCA - Young Men's Christian Association
YWCA - Young Women's Christian Association

MODEL PROJECTS ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY FOR RACIAL AND ETHNIC MINORITY WOMEN AND GIRLS

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer ** affiliations (if listed) ***
1.*BA	Spanish/ Sociology	Baldwin-Wallace College	H	Coordinator, Title IX, Cuyahoga Community College Federation of Business & Professional Women National Organization for Women Women's Equity Action League American Society for Personnel Administration
2. Ed.D	Ed. & Public Administration	U. of Idaho	W	President, Utah Technical College President, South Utah State College Associate Commissioner of Higher Ed., Utah President, Highline College Zion Natural History Association Iowa Association of College Presidents Puget Sound Regional Minority Affairs Consortium NEA
M.Ed	Ed. Administration	" " "		
BS	Vocational Agriculture	Utah State U.		
3.*Ed.S	Special Ed.	George Washington U.	B	Principal, Stevens Elementary School Assistant Principal, Weatherless Elementary School Black Congressional Advisory Committee YMCA American Psychological Association National Council of Negro Women Psychiatric Institute, Inc. NAACP National Association for Mental Health National Association of Elementary School Principals
MA	Elementary Ed.	" " "		
4. NI	Constitutional Law Women's Rights Family Law	Princeton U., Cont. Ed. Rutgers U., Cont. Ed. Brookdale Coll. Trenton State Coll.	W	Consultant, Heritage Foundation Advisor, Superintendent of Schools Lecturer, Rutgers U., Montclair State College
5. MS	Public Relations	Phoenix U.	W	Self-employed Fine Arts Appraiser Manager of law office State Press Secretary, George Bush Campaign Administrative Specialist, U. of Wisconsin, Spanish Speaking Out-Reach Institute Project Specialist, U. of Wisconsin Business Manager, Antiques Limited Women in Communications, Inc. American Association of U. Women
BS	Journalism/Political Science	Marquette U.		
6. NI	Ed.	U. of South Florida	W	None indicated Eagle Forum

---

*Originally invited by WEEAP staff; invitation was not canceled.

** Employment history covers January 1, 1975, through April 1982.

***Affiliations cover January 1, 1981, through April 1982.

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
7. Ed.D	Curriculum	U. of South California	W	Professor of Ed., King College
MA	School Administration	California State U.		
BA	Political Science	Occidental College		
8. JD	Law	Atlanta Law School	B	Consultant, private consulting firm Drug Abuse Counselor, Southside Community Health Ctr. Executive Director, Miami Valley Child Development Center National Association of Black Women Attorneys National Council of Negro Women Georgia Trial Lawyers Association Jack & Jill of America, Inc.
MS	Guidance & Counseling	Wright State U.		
BS	Elementary Ed.	Central State U.		
9. Ph.D	Communications	Ohio State U.	W	Associate Professor, Cedarville Coll. Associate Academic Dean, Cedarville Coll.
MA	Communications	U. of Cincinnati		
BA	Speech	Bob Jones U.		
10. Ph.D1/	Ed. Sociology	U. of North Carolina	B	Sociologist of Ed., Research Scientist/Project Director, Center for Social Organization of Schools, J. Hopkins U. Assistant Professor of Sociology, Memphis State U. American Sociological Association American Educational Review Association Society for the Study of Social Problems NAACP
MA	Sociology	" " " "		
11. M.Ed	Education Evaluation/Social Studies	U. of Maryland	W	Contract Researcher, Ofc. of Ed Research & Improvement, Dept. of Ed. Piano and Music Teacher, Home Music Teachers Asso. Service Personnel Manager, Recycled Paper Products Alexandria Hospital Corp. Keyette International Svc. Club Parish Advisory Council
BA	Ed/Social Studies	U. of Maryland		
12. Ph.D	Ed. Admin.	U. of Michigan	B	Director, Continuing Ed. for Girls, Detroit Public Schools NAACP Republican Women's Task Force Detroit Young Republicans The Professional Women's Network Michigan Association Concerned With School Age Parents National Alliance of Black Schools Educators (Several others)
MSW	Psychiatric Social Work	Howard U.		
MA	English	Howard U.		
13.*Ed.D	Administration	Nova U.	W	Manager, Secondary Field Services, Calif, State Dept. of Ed.
MA	Political Science	U. of San Francisco		
14. MS	Physical Ed	U. of Washington	H	Physical Ed. Instructor, Bellevue Community Coll. Doctoral Student, Higher Ed., U. of Washington
BA	Biology & Phys. Ed.	New Mexico Highlands U.		

1/Served as a field reader for 1 day only.

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
15. NI			W	
16. MS	Counseling & Personnel Administration	Not indicated	NA	Doctoral Student, Counseling and Personnel Administration, Michigan State
MODEL PROJECTS ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY FOR RACIAL AND ETHNIC MINORITY WOMEN AND GIRLS MODEL PROJECTS TO INFLUENCE LEADERS IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION				
17. Ph.D MA BA	Linguistics English Bible, English	Indiana U. U. of North Carolina Bob Jones U.	W	Chairman, Curriculum Committee for English Skills Textbooks, Bob Jones U. Chairman, Dept. of English Ed., Bob Jones U. Director, Missionary Linguistics Seminar (Summer)
18. Ed.D MA	Ed. English	U. of Oklahoma U. of Arkansas	W	Dean of Academic Affairs, Director of Graduate Studies & Professor of Ed., East Texas State U. Vice President for Academic Affairs & Professor of Ed., Wayland Baptist Coll. Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development Texas Assoc. for Supervision and Curriculum Texas Association of Coll. Teachers Lions Club
19. MS MS B.Ed BS	Interdisciplinary Advertising Ed. General Science	U. of Oregon " " " East. Oregon Coll. Oregon State U.	W	Director, Ed. Opportunity Program, U. of Oregon Director, Learning Resource Center, U. of Oregon
MODEL PROJECTS TO INFLUENCE LEADERS IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION				
20. BS	English/Speech Journalism/Ed.	Bradley U.	W	None Indicated Delegate - White House Conference on Aging - DHHS
21. Ed.D MA AB	Administration & Supervision Ed. Music Ed.	West Virginia U. Rutgers Graduate School of Ed. West Virginia U. Fairmont State Coll.	W	Professor, Elementary/Special Ed., Rutgers Coll., Rutgers U. Women's National Republican Club Westfield Women's Republican Club Republican Women of Union County Republican Presidential Task Force Interaction Platform Association
22. MA BA	Guidance Elementary Ed.	U. of South Florida U. of Florida	H	Principal, Oak-Land Jr. High School Administrative Assistant, Rosemount High School Dean of Girls, Blake Jr. High School
23. MS MS BS	Counseling/Ed. Remedial Reading Elementary/ Special Ed.	Purdue U. " " Brigham U.	W	Teacher, Learning Disabilities, Fairfax County Public Schools Teacher, Waltham Jr. & Senior High School, Battle Ground Elementary
24. BS	Elementary Ed.	Abilene Christian U.	W	Teacher - 6th Grade

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
25.*Ph.D MA	Reading Elementary Ed.	Florida State Hampton Institute	B	Director of Sex Desegregation Training Institute, Jackson State U. Associate Professor of Continuing Ed/Elementary Ed., Jackson State U. Reading Instructor, Bishop State Jr. Coll. International Reading Association Alabama Reading Association National Reading Council American Association of Teachers of English Concerned Educators of Black Students
MODEL PROJECTS TO ELIMINATE PERSISTENT BARRIERS TO EDUCATIONAL EQUITY FOR WOMEN				
26. NI			W	Unemployed
27. BS	Home Economics	U. of Tennessee	W	Self-Employed Genealogist Benefit Authorizer, Social Security Administration Instructor, Dept. of Continuing Ed., U. of Alabama
28. NI	Liberal Arts	U. of Detroit	W	Unemployed Alternate Delegate, Republican State Issues Committee Michigan Citizens to Support the Presidency Republican State Issues Committee Women's Republican Club
29. DDS BS	Dentistry Fire Protection & Safety Engineering	U. of California Dental School Illinois Institute of Technology	W	Dentist, self-employed
30. Ed.D BS	Ed. Spanish/French	U. of Havana Memphis State U.	H	Executive Director, Latin American Ed. Center Ed. Project Director, Dept. for the Spanish Speaking People Language Dept. Chairman, St. Francis Coll. NEA, Indian State Teachers Assoc. National League of Cuban American Community-Based Centers Cuban American Legal Defense & Educational Fund National Association of Cuban American Women
31. MA AB	Adult Ed. Psychology/Ed.	George Washington U. U. of Illinois	W	Consultant, Displaced Homemakers Network Program Coordinator for American Association Community & Jr. Coll. Jewish Community Center's Open U. Jewish Vocational Service Employment Service

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
32. Ph.D (cand)	French/Applied Linguistics	U. of Maryland	W	Coordinator, English as a second language, Fairfax County Public Schools Teacher of English as second language, French, Spanish, Government & Social Studies, Fairfax County Public Schools American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language Teachers of English to Speakers of other Languages Virginia Association for Curriculum & Supervision Virginia Foreign Language/English as a second language Supervisors Association
MA	Government/Economics	Georgetown U.		
AB	Political Science/Economics	Duquesne U.		
33. MA	Guidance & Counseling	Texas Southern U.	B	Director, Cooperative Ed., Texas Southern Univ. Coordinator Cooperative Ed., Texas Southern Univ. Instructor, North Harris County Coll. Head Draftsman/Assistant Personnel Administrator, private engineering company National Cooperative Ed. Association Texas Cooperative Ed. Association
BS	Industrial Ed.			
34. BA	Chemistry	U. of Cincinnati	W	Teacher, Alamogordo Public Schools, New Mexico
35. BM	Music	Northwestern U.	W	Owner & Manager of Farm Business Board of Directors of Pro-Family of Ill.
36. Ph.D (cand.)	Comparative Ed./History of Ed.	U. of Pennsylvania	W	Director of Alumni Association & Acting Publications Director, Intercoll. Studies Institute Consultant, Dept of Ed., HHS District Supervisor, National Assessment of Ed. Progress Project Research Triangle Park, North Carolina Proofreader & Copy Editor for the Intercollegiate Review, The Political Science Reviewer, & The Academic Reviewer
M.Ed	Psychology of Reading	Temple U.		
BA	Anthropology	U. of Pittsburgh		
37. BA	English/Political Science	Brigham Young U.	W	National Director - Center of Family Studies, Freeman Institute Author & Lecturer, Brigham Young U. and other Institutions
38. MA	Not indicated	Sangamon State U.	W	Teacher Advisory Board, Elementary and Secondary Ed. Illinois Community College Trustees Association Trustee Lincoln Land Community College
BA	Ed	Southern Illinois U.		
39. NI	General Science Psychology	Portland C.C. Portland State U.	W	Realtor, Mr. Real Estate Inc.
40. NI	Music/English	Wichita U.	W	Loan Processor for Local Federal Savings & Loan Prestonwest Republican Women's Club Eagle Forum Daughters of the American Revolution Engineers' Wives Club

MODEL PROJECTS ON TITLE IX COMPLIANCE
MODEL PROJECTS TO ELIMINATE PERSISTENT BARRIERS TO EDUCATIONAL EQUITY FOR WOMEN

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
41. MA	Ed. Admin.	Howard U.	B	Consultant, Texas Coordinating Board of College & Univ. Personnel Officer, Texas Rehabilitation Commission Training Manager & Internal Consultant for private firm Special Research Projects Coordinator, private aircraft company Texas State Board of Dental Examiners Campfire Inc. United Negro College Fund Austin Urban League American Society of Training & Development United Way Board
BA	English/Secondary Ed.	Fisk U.		
42. MA	English	U. of South Carolina	W	Freelance Writer
AB	Journalism	" " " . "		
NI	English	Duke U.		
43.*Ph.D	Ed. Leadership	U.S. International U.	B	Assistant Chief, Intergroup Relations, State Dept. of Ed.
MA	Ed.	U. of California, Berkeley		
BA	Ed.	San Francisco State		

MODEL PROJECTS ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY FOR DISABLED WOMEN AND GIRLS AND
MODEL PROJECTS TO ELIMINATE PERSISTENT BARRIERS TO EDUCATIONAL EQUITY FOR WOMEN

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
44. Ph.D	Ed. Psychology	U.S.C.	W	Senior School Psychologist, Los Angeles Unified School District School Psychologist/Counselor, Los Angeles Unified; Orange Coast Coll. California Association for Neurologically Handicapped Children National Society for Autistic Children
MS	Special Ed.	California State U.		
BA	English	Mount St. Mary's Coll.		
45. NI	None indicated	None indicated	W	Occupation/Employer not indicated Eagle Forum Ed. Committee Textbook Selection Committee
46. AA	Speech & Drama	San Bernardino Jr. Coll.	W	Unemployed Member, Nevada State Board of Ed. Republican Women's Club of South Nevada Las Vegas Valley Republican Women's Club Nevada Vocational Association National Association of State Board of Ed. National Adult Ed. Association Nevada Community Ed. Association
47. Ed.D	Vocational Ed. Postsecondary Ed.	Nova U.	W	Dept. Head - English, Pensacola Jr. Coll. Free-lance curriculum writer, Baptist Sunday School Board Writing lab instructor, Pensacola Jr. Coll.
MA	English	U. of West Florida		
BA	English Ed.	" " " "		

MODEL PROJECTS ON TITLE IX COMPLIANCE

Degree	Field	University/college	Ethnicity	Occupation/employer affiliations (if listed)
48. MA BS	Speech "	Marquette U. Bob Jones U.	W	Doctoral Student Library Acquisition Assistant, Dept. of Communication, Purdue U. Graduate Teaching Assistant, Dept. of Communications, Purdue U. High School English Teacher, Marquette Manor High School, Illinois Assistant Forensics Director, Menomonee Falls East High School, Wisconsin Christian Legal Society Speech Communications Association Institute for the Study of Trial Central States Speech Association American Association of Univ. Women
49. MA BS	Teacher Ed. Art Ed.	Hunter Coll. Rhode Island Coll.	W	Vocational Teacher, N.Y. School of Printing Curriculum Development Vocational/Occupational N.Y. City
50. BA	Chemistry	U. of Oklahoma Vassar Coll.	W	Unemployed Oklahoma Federation of Republican Women
51. NI	Pre-med	U. of Illinois	W	President, private consulting firm National Committee for the Status of Women Indiana Commission of the International Year of the Child
52. MA BS	Music Ed. Music Ed.	Southeast Missouri U. " " "	W	Instructor of voice & piano, Southeast Missouri State U. Skin care consultant, Jafra Cosmetics Southeast Teachers Association Business Women's Association Humane Society Red Star Baptist Church
MODEL PROJECTS ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY FOR DISABLED WOMEN AND GIRLS				
53. MA BS	Elementary Ed. " "	Southeast Missouri State U. " " " "	W	Private piano teacher 6th Grade Eng. Teacher, Sikeston Middle School
54. MS BS	Ed. Criminology	Butler U. Indiana State U.	W	Lecturer in Ed., Butler U. Branch Director, Day Nursery Association President, N.W. Cooperative Pre-School Consultant, Episcopal Community Services Director Counselor, Patsie Thomas Home for Girls American Association on Mental Deficiency
55. BS	Elementary Ed.	U. of Utah	W	Real Estate Agent, Salt Lake Realty Certified Teacher, Jordan Valley School for the Retarded & Handicapped National Board of Realtors Salt Lake Board of Realtors NEA Utah Ed. Association Jordan Ed. Association